

## RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, September 4, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATION

*Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 31 (legislative day of August 5), 1940*

POSTMASTER

WEST VIRGINIA

Doyle Phillips, Philippi.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we would wait on the Lord and find our strength in the heights. We beseech Thee to bless our President, our Speaker, the Congress, and every citizen of our country. To us has been given the task of establishing a citadel of freedom so strong that by our example the world may be redeemed from the poisonous weapon that bares its teeth into the breast of mercy and into the heart of love. In these perilous times, do Thou give wisdom, understanding, and caution to all.

O Thou who maketh the day to succeed the night and the light to shine out of darkness, we pray Thee to give us a resting place for our faith as beneath the lights of the firmament we stand and tremble; we seek Thee, O Christ, for our pains and tears. The joy and gladness of the happy hearts of a yesterday have been torn and shattered; they are bleeding because of the tragic death of their loved ones; noon-day brightness has been transformed into the shades of sunset. Oh, in the silence of their desert hours, help them to recognize the Voice that spoke over the turbulent waters ages ago, saying, "Be not afraid; lo, I am with thee, and I will go with thee all the way"; in the tunnel of their affliction, let the light shine from Thy holy mount. Oh, wait for them in the tears of Bethany, in the cross of Jerusalem, and in the songs of Galilee. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 30, 1940, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3481. An act for the relief of C. Z. Bush and W. D. Kennedy; and

H. R. 4126. An act for the relief of Warren Zimmerman.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

## THE LATE SENATOR ERNEST LUNDEEN

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my melancholy task to announce to the House of Representatives the untimely passing of Minnesota's junior Senator, ERNEST LUNDEEN, who met his death in a tragic accident on Saturday afternoon.

Mr. LUNDEEN became a Member of this body in the Sixty-fifth Congress. He was of the same class as Speaker BANKHEAD, SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, MARVIN JONES, CLARENCE F. LEA, JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, CHRISTOPHER D. SULLIVAN, and myself.

Of the 69 new Members who came in at that time but 7 remain.

Our departed friend early distinguished himself as a fearless and courageous legislator. It was his pride that he was one of the small band that voted against America's entrance into the World War, and if my memory serves me correctly he was the only one to vote against the declaration of war against Austria and Turkey 8 months later.

Senator LUNDEEN, a veteran of the Spanish-American War, was elected a Representative at Large from Minnesota in 1932 and 4 years later the voters of that State selected him to be their junior Senator.

Our friend has passed on to that bourne from whose shores no traveler returns but his memory will long remain green with those who admire loyalty, honesty, and courage. We extend to the sorrowing wife and children our sincere sympathy and pray that they will be comforted and sustained in the knowledge that their loved one has written in letters of eternal light his biography on the immortal scroll of history.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday's tragedy which snuffed out the life of Minnesota's beloved Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN and 24 other passengers in the air-liner crash means to me the death of a martyr to a cause, the cause of peace and of free government for the common people of this Nation. He had spent all the mature years of his life fighting for these great principles and had not spared himself at any point. He had even served in the armed forces as a volunteer in the Spanish-American War, where he offered his life to his country.

He was my friend, and as the Member of this House from my district in the tragic war years of 1916-17 and again from 1932 to 1936 when he was elevated to the Senate, he set the model and the example of service to the public cause which has been a goal for my service here, too. Indeed he set such a high standard of service to our great district that when reelected for the third time in 1934 he received approximately 69,000 votes as compared to a total of only about 50,000 votes for the congressional candidates of the 2 major national political parties.

His untimely death is a real tragedy at this time of crisis in our Nation's affairs, testing as is being done, whether might is right, or whether the power of Christian principles and the original tenets of our Republic shall live or die. For weeks past he had been daily fighting, valiantly, unceasingly to keep America's institutions free from dictatorship and from the despoiling hand of despotism, selfishness, hypocrisy, and undemocratic trends.

The sacrifice of his life should mean but one thing to us: it should mean a challenge to this House of Representatives and especially to the Members of this body who have served with the Senator and who knew his devotion to the real cause of peace. It should mean that we must today, as we face the task of disposing of this conscription bill which we start consideration of shortly now, grasp the torch of peace and liberty as it falls from his lifeless hands and hold it high as he has been wont to do. It should mean that we shall consecrate our services in this awful hour to a perpetuation of all the fine principles and ideals for which he stood. His arm is down, his tongue is stilled, his heart no longer beats for the cause he loved so well, the cause of peace and justice and liberty. His body is now lovingly wrapped in an eternal repose and peaceful calm. He can no longer fight our people's fight in person, but his spirit can fight on and on as its zeal is transmitted and as its faith fires our own living bodies to a new spirit of devotion.

In that spirit and in the name of our departed comrade and fellow worker, Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, I exhort all Members of this body to carry on, to stem the rising tide of un-American heresies, and to do it right now, this week, here in the House of Representatives by standing firmly, resolutely against the dictatorship inherent in the suggestion of peace-

time conscription. As my own first personal contribution, I dedicate to his memory the article which I had prepared before the Senator's death, entitled "A Good Substitute for Conscription," and which is to be found in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL].

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, how often have we heard the expression figuratively used in describing our feelings toward a deceased friend, "He was a good soldier." Today I stand before you and humbly say that the late Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, was a "good soldier." He was a hard fighter but, best of all, he fought with courage; he fought with conviction for the things which he believed were right; he fought cleanly. He was a good soldier not only figuratively but literally, for he honorably served his country as a volunteer in the Spanish-American War. So today as we mourn his untimely passing let us keep in mind the outstanding human qualities which he so ably displayed during his life as a guide in our future actions for America.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTINGER].

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with other colleagues from Minnesota in a tribute to Senator ERNEST H. LUNDEEN, who was killed in an airplane accident last Saturday. We were personal friends. I served with him in this House before he was elevated to the Senate of the United States. As colleagues, we learned to know each other and to respect each other. I held him in high regard, and I join with others in expressions of sorrow at his untimely passing.

Senator LUNDEEN was a man of courage and integrity. When he took a position on public questions he was guided not by questions of expediency but by what he thought was the right thing to do. From that standpoint he could not be lured or forced to a change. No matter how strong public opinion might be he would not change to some different viewpoint. This great virtue in men in public life was his strongest attribute.

Senator LUNDEEN was patriotic. He served his country in time of war, and in time of peace battled to make it a better place in which the ordinary man and woman might find happiness, safety, and freedom. He was always the friend of the underdog and never betrayed a trust.

Senator LUNDEEN was a faithful public servant. He assumed the responsibilities of his great office seriously and worked hard to measure up. He succeeded in attaining the high standards required of public officials. With his death the Congress of the United States has suffered a great loss, and the State of Minnesota likewise loses one of its outstanding leaders.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Wednesday, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address by Colonel Fleming.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests, one to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Cleveland News, and the other to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include an article from the Jewish Veteran.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by the Reverend Dr. W. Pascoe Goard. Second, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "The International Situation" and also excerpts from other magazines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by the Honorable Adolph Starr, of La Fayette, Ind., on the subject of liberty and freedom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Lynchburg (Va.) Advance entitled "Draft of Wealth."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from the Metal Trades Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address entitled "The Union Label Defense" by I. M. Ornburn, of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, it has been well said that there is nothing great in this universe but man and nothing great in man but his mind. It is the mind of man which explores the universe and unravels its secrets and mysteries; it is this mind which conceives and creates structures which reflect man's approach to his Creator.

The world is full of rare men and women, some who never enter the threshold of great opportunity but live out their time in unselfish sacrifice that others may be made happy and enjoy the light of knowledge and pleasures of this life. There are many, however, who seize opportunity by its forelock and follow the path of wisdom until they are admired by their fellow men and justly exalted throughout history.

There is nothing so tragic in life as a failure, but success cannot be measured by a finite yardstick. The query will always be, What did the servant do with his talent? And this question alone and its answer will determine man's final judgment and the disposition of his soul. There has just passed from a conspicuous public service in this Nation a rare character; one who followed the teachings of a godly unselfish parentage and who is so strong that no evil has ever scratched the bright shield of his character and no habit has ever shackled his self-mastery. He, evidently, like most public men, has passed through the fires of temptation yet the finger of lust has never touched the hem of his garment; he has followed the invisible law of rectitude and is so clean, and has ever been, that his life and his friendship has been a benediction to all of those with whom he has come in contact, and those love him best who know him intimately.

This man, since he was called to conspicuous service in this Nation, has adorned every public place he has ever held because of his great character, and it is eternally true "that character is the diamond that scratches every other stone." He has been chairman of a great political party in the greatest democracy on earth. How well he filled this position may well inspire all others to endeavor to emulate his conduct. No one has ever called him a demagogue and no one ever dared to impeach his fidelity to the cause he served. He has sat in the administrative council of this great Nation for more than 7 years, and his advice has been measured by wisdom and his purpose so patriotic that none, not even his adversaries, dare impeach his motive. I shall not carry this tribute in my heart but I shall record it today in the records of this Nation and feel that I have made no mistake and that I simply share the feeling and appreciation and sentiment of every man and woman who admire and love the conduct, the personality, and the character of James A. Farley. [Applause.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to submit. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and also to include a letter and an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein resolutions from Mason County (Ky.) Farm Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I also request that I may be permitted to include with the remarks which I hope to make on the conscription bill two quotations and the text of a short bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an article on taxation that appeared in the American magazine. It may be a little longer than the customary amount that is allowed, but not very much.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the article is more than two and a half pages the gentleman will have to get an estimate.

The SPEAKER. That is the rule.

Mr. RICH. And I would advise the gentleman to do that before he requests this permission.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I will ask for the permission as indicated, because I do not think it is more than two and a half pages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—LEASE OF NAVAL AND AIR BASES (H. DOC. 943)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed, as follows:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, notes exchanged between the British Ambassador at Washington and the Secretary of State on September 2, 1940, under which this Government has acquired the right to lease naval and air bases in Newfoundland, and in the islands of Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Santa Lucia, Trinidad, and Antigua, and in British Guiana; also a copy of an opinion of the Attorney General, dated August 27, 1940, regarding my authority to consummate this arrangement.

The right to bases in Newfoundland and Bermuda are gifts—generously given and gladly received. The other bases mentioned have been acquired in exchange for 50 of our over-age destroyers.

This is not inconsistent in any sense with our status of peace. Still less is it a threat against any nation. It is an epochal and far-reaching act of preparation for continental defense in the face of grave danger.

Preparation for defense is an inalienable prerogative of a sovereign state. Under present circumstances this exercise of sovereign right is essential to the maintenance of our peace and safety. This is the most important action in the reinforcement of our national defense that has been taken since the Louisiana Purchase. Then, as now, considerations of safety from overseas attack were fundamental.

The value to the Western Hemisphere of these outposts of security is beyond calculation. Their need has long been recognized by our country, and especially by those primarily charged with the duty of charting and organizing our own naval and military defense. They are essential to the protection of the Panama Canal, Central America, the northern portion of South America, the Antilles, Canada, Mexico, and our own eastern and Gulf seaboard. Their consequent importance in hemispheric defense is obvious. For these reasons I have taken advantage of the present opportunity to acquire them.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 3, 1940.

#### BRITISH EMBASSY,

Washington, D. C., September 2, 1940.

SIR: I have the honor under instructions from His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to inform you that in view of the friendly and sympathetic interest of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in the national security of the United States and their desire to strengthen the ability of the United States to cooperate effectively with the other nations of the Americas in the defense of the Western Hemisphere, His Majesty's Government will secure the grant to the Government of the United States, freely and without consideration, of the lease for immediate establishment and use of naval and air bases and facilities for entrance thereto and the operation and protection thereof, on the Avalon Peninsula and on the southern coast of Newfoundland, and on the east coast and on the Great Bay of Bermuda.

Furthermore, in view of the above and in view of the desire of the United States to acquire additional air and naval bases in the Caribbean and in British Guiana, and without endeavoring to place a monetary or commercial value upon the many tangible and intangible rights and properties involved, His Majesty's Government will make available to the United States for immediate establishment and use naval and air bases and facilities for entrance thereto and the operation and protection thereof, on the eastern side of the Bahamas, the southern coast of Jamaica, the western coast of Santa Lucia, the west coast of Trinidad in the Gulf of Paria, in the island of Antigua, and in British Guiana within 50 miles of Georgetown, in exchange for naval and military equipment and material which the United States Government will transfer to His Majesty's Government.

All the bases and facilities referred to in the preceding paragraphs will be leased to the United States for a period of 99 years, free from all rent and charges other than such compensation to be mutually agreed on to be paid by the United States in order to compensate the owners of private property for loss by expropriation or damage arising out of the establishment of the bases and facilities in question.

His Majesty's Government, in the leases to be agreed upon, will grant to the United States for the period of the leases all the rights, power, and authority within the bases leased, and within the limits of the territorial waters and air spaces adjacent to or in the vicinity of such bases, necessary to provide access to and defense of such bases, and appropriate provisions for their control.

Without prejudice to the above-mentioned rights of the United States authorities and their jurisdiction within the leased areas, the adjustment and reconciliation between the jurisdiction of the authorities of the United States within these areas and the jurisdiction of the authorities of the territories in which these areas are situated, shall be determined by common agreement.

The exact location and bounds of the aforesaid bases, the necessary seaward, coast, and antiaircraft defenses, the location of sufficient military garrisons, stores, and other necessary auxiliary facilities shall be determined by common agreement.

His Majesty's Government are prepared to designate immediately experts to meet with experts of the United States for these purposes. Should these experts be unable to agree in any particular situation, except in the case of Newfoundland and Bermuda, the matter shall be settled by the Secretary of State of the United States and His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient, humble servant,

LOTHIAN.

THE HONORABLE CORDELL HULL,  
Secretary of State of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, September 2, 1940.

EXCELLENCY: I have received your note of September 2, 1940, of which the text is as follows:

"I have the honor, under instructions from His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, to inform you that in view of the friendly and sympathetic interest of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in the national security of the United States and their desire to strengthen the ability of the United States to cooperate effectively with the other nations of the Americas in the defense of the Western Hemisphere, His Majesty's Government will secure the grant to the Government of the United States, freely and without consideration, of the lease for immediate establishment and use of naval and air bases and facilities for entrance thereto and the operation and protection thereof, on the Avalon Peninsula and on the southern coast of Newfoundland, and on the east coast and on the Great Bay of Bermuda.

"Furthermore, in view of the above and in view of the desire of the United States to acquire additional air and naval bases in the Caribbean and in British Guiana, and without endeavoring to place a monetary or commercial value upon the many tangible and intangible rights and properties involved, His Majesty's Government will make available to the United States, for immediate establishment and use, naval and air bases and facilities for entrance thereto and the operation and protection thereof, on the eastern side of the Bahamas, the southern coast of Jamaica, the western coast of Santa Lucia, the west coast of Trinidad in the Gulf of Paria, in the island of Antigua, and in British Guiana within 50 miles of Georgetown, in exchange for naval and military equipment and material which the United States Government will transfer to His Majesty's Government.

"All the bases and facilities referred to in the preceding paragraphs will be leased to the United States for a period of 99 years, free from all rent and charges other than such compensation to be mutually agreed on to be paid by the United States in order to compensate the owners of private property for loss by expropriation or damage arising out of the establishment of the bases and facilities in question.

"His Majesty's Government, in the leases to be agreed upon, will grant to the United States for the period of the leases all the rights, power, and authority within the bases leased, and within the limits of the territorial waters and air spaces adjacent to or in the vicinity of such bases, necessary to provide access to and defense of such bases, and appropriate provisions for their control.

"Without prejudice to the above-mentioned rights of the United States authorities and their jurisdiction within the leased areas, the adjustment and reconciliation between the jurisdiction of the authorities of the United States within these areas and the jurisdiction of the authorities of the territories in which these areas are situated, shall be determined by common agreement.

"The exact location and bounds of the aforesaid bases, the necessary seaward, coast, and antiaircraft defenses, the location of sufficient military garrisons, stores, and other necessary auxiliary facilities shall be determined by common agreement.

"His Majesty's Government are prepared to designate immediately experts to meet with experts of the United States for these purposes.

"Should these experts be unable to agree in any particular situation, except in the case of Newfoundland and Bermuda, the matter shall be settled by the Secretary of State of the United States and His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

I am directed by the President to reply to your note as follows:

The Government of the United States appreciates the declarations and the generous action of His Majesty's Government as contained in your communication which are destined to enhance the national security of the United States and greatly to strengthen its ability to cooperate effectively with the other nations of the Americas in the defense of the Western Hemisphere. It therefore gladly accepts the proposals,

The Government of the United States will immediately designate experts to meet with experts designated by His Majesty's Government to determine upon the exact location of the naval and air bases mentioned in your communication under acknowledgment.

In consideration of the declarations above quoted, the Government of the United States will immediately transfer to His Majesty's Government 50 United States Navy destroyers generally referred to as the 1,200-ton type.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

CORDELL HULL.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE MARQUESS OF  
LOTHIAN, C. H., British Ambassador.

AUGUST 27, 1940.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with your request, I have considered your constitutional and statutory authority to proceed by Executive agreement with the British Government immediately to acquire for the United States certain offshore naval and air bases in the Atlantic Ocean without awaiting the inevitable delays which would accompany the conclusion of a formal treaty.

The essential characteristics of the proposal are:

(a) The United States to acquire rights for immediate establishment and use of naval and air bases in Newfoundland, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Santa Lucia, Trinidad, and British Guiana, such rights to endure for a period of 99 years and to include adequate provisions for access to and defense of such bases and appropriate provisions for their control.

(b) In consideration it is proposed to transfer to Great Britain the title and possession of certain over-age ships and obsolescent military materials now the property of the United States and certain other small patrol boats which, though nearly completed, are already obsolescent.

(c) Upon such transfer all obligation of the United States is discharged. The acquisition consists only of rights, which the United States may exercise or not at its option; and if exercised, may abandon without consent. The privilege of maintaining such bases is subject only to limitations necessary to reconcile United States use with the sovereignty retained by Great Britain. Our Government assumes no responsibility for civil administration of any territory. It makes no promise to erect structures or maintain forces at any point. It undertakes no defense of the possessions of any country. In short, it acquires optional bases which may be developed as Congress appropriates funds therefor, but the United States does not assume any continuing or future obligation, commitment, or alliance.

The questions of constitutional and statutory authority, with which alone I am concerned, seem to be these:

First. May such an acquisition be concluded by the President under an Executive agreement, or must it be negotiated as a treaty, subject to ratification by the Senate?

Second. Does authority exist in the President to alienate the title to such ships and obsolescent materials; and if so, on what conditions?

Third. Do the statutes of the United States limit the right to deliver the so-called mosquito boats now under construction or the over-age destroyers by reason of the belligerent status of Great Britain?

I

There is, of course, no doubt concerning the authority of the President to negotiate with the British Government for the proposed exchange. The only questions that might be raised in connection therewith are (1) whether the arrangement must be put in the form of a treaty and await ratification by the Senate or (2) whether there must be additional legislation by the Congress.

Ordinarily, and assuming the absence of enabling legislation, the question whether such an agreement can be concluded under Presidential authority or whether it must await ratification by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate involves consideration of two powers which the Constitution vests in the President.

One of these is the power of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, which is conferred upon the President by the Constitution but is not defined or limited. Happily, there has been little occasion in our history for the interpretation of the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. I do not find it necessary to rest upon that power alone to sustain the present proposal. But it will hardly be open to controversy that the vesting of such a function in the President also places upon him a responsibility to use all constitutional authority which he may possess to provide adequate bases and stations for the utilization of the naval and air weapons of the United States at their highest efficiency in our defense. It seems equally beyond doubt that present world conditions forbid him to risk any delay that is constitutionally avoidable.

The second power to be considered is that control of foreign relations which the Constitution vests in the President as a part of the Executive function. The nature and extent of this power has recently been explicitly and authoritatively defined by Mr. Justice Sutherland, writing for the Supreme Court. In 1936, in *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation, et al.*, 299 U. S. 304, he said:

"It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power, but with such an authority plus the very delicate,

plenary, and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require as a basis for its exercise an act of Congress, but which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution. It is quite apparent that if, in the maintenance of our international relations, embarrassment—perhaps serious embarrassment—is to be avoided and success for our aims achieved, congressional legislation which is to be made effective through negotiation and inquiry within the international field must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved. Moreover, he, not Congress, has the better opportunity of knowing the conditions which prevail in foreign countries, and especially is this true in time of war. He has his confidential sources of information. He has his agents in the form of diplomatic, consular, and other officials. Secrecy in respect of information gathered by them may be highly necessary, and the premature disclosure of it productive of harmful results."

The President's power over foreign relations while "delicate, plenary, and exclusive" is not unlimited. Some negotiations involve commitments as to the future which would carry an obligation to exercise powers vested in the Congress. Such Presidential arrangements are customarily submitted for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate before the future legislative power of the country is committed. However, the acquisitions which you are proposing to accept are without express or implied promises on the part of the United States to be performed in the future. The consideration, which we later discuss, is completed upon transfer of the specified items. The Executive agreement obtains an opportunity to establish naval and air bases for the protection of our coastline but it imposes no obligation upon the Congress to appropriate money to improve the opportunity. It is not necessary for the Senate to ratify an opportunity that entails no obligation.

There are precedents which might be cited, but not all strictly pertinent. The proposition falls far short in magnitude of the acquisition by President Jefferson of the Louisiana Territory from a belligerent during a European war, the Congress later appropriating the consideration and the Senate later ratifying a treaty embodying the agreement.

I am also reminded that in 1850, Secretary of State Daniel Webster acquired Horse Shoe Reef, at the entrance of Buffalo Harbor, upon condition that the United States would engage to erect a lighthouse and maintain a light but would erect no fortification thereon. This was done without awaiting legislative authority. Subsequently the Congress made appropriations for the lighthouse, which was erected in 1856. (Malloy, *Treaties and Conventions*, vol. 1, p. 663.)

It is not believed, however, that it is necessary here to rely exclusively upon your constitutional power. As pointed out herein-after (in discussing the second question), I think there is also ample statutory authority to support the acquisition of these bases, and the precedents perhaps most nearly in point are the numerous acquisitions of rights in foreign countries for sites of diplomatic and consular establishments—perhaps also the trade agreements recently negotiated under statutory authority and the acquisition in 1903 of the coaling and naval stations and rights in Cuba under the act of March 2, 1901 (ch. 803, 31 Stat. 895, 898). In the last-mentioned case the agreement was subsequently embodied in a treaty but it was only one of a number of undertakings, some clearly of a nature to be dealt with ordinarily by treaty, and the statute had required "that by way of further assurance the Government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States."

The transaction now proposed represents only an exchange with no statutory requirement for the embodiment thereof in any treaty and involving no promises or undertakings by the United States that might raise the question of the propriety of incorporation in a treaty. I therefore advise that acquisition by Executive agreement of the rights proposed to be conveyed to the United States by Great Britain will not require ratification by the Senate.

## II

The right of the President to dispose of vessels of the Navy and unneeded naval material finds clear recognition in at least two enactments of the Congress and a decision of the Supreme Court—and any who assert that the authority does not exist must assume the burden of establishing that both the Congress and the Supreme Court meant something less than the clear import of seemingly plain language.

By section 5 of the act of March 3, 1883, c. 141, 22 Stat. 582, 599–600 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 492), the Congress placed restrictions upon the methods to be followed by the Secretary of the Navy in disposing of naval vessels, which have been found unfit for further use and stricken from the naval registry, but by the last clause of the section recognized and confirmed such a right in the President free from such limitations. It provides:

"But no vessel of the Navy shall hereafter be sold in any other manner than herein provided, or for less than such appraised value, unless the President of the United States shall otherwise direct in writing." [Italics supplied.]

In *Levinson v. United States* (258 U. S. 198, 201), the Supreme Court said of this statute that "the power of the President to direct a departure from the statute is not confined to a sale for less than the appraised value but extends to the manner of the sale," and that "the word 'unless' qualifies both the requirements of the concluding clause."

So far as concerns this statute, in my opinion, it leaves the President as Commander in Chief of the Navy, free to make such disposition of naval vessels as he finds necessary in the public interest, and I find nothing that would indicate that the Congress has tried to limit the President's plenary powers to vessels already stricken from the naval registry. The President, of course, would exercise his powers only under the high sense of responsibility which follows his rank as Commander in Chief of his Nation's defense forces.

Furthermore, I find in no other statute or in the decisions any attempted limitations upon the plenary powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and as the head of the State in its relations with foreign countries to enter into the proposed arrangements for the transfer to the British Government of certain overage destroyers and obsolescent military material except the limitations recently imposed by section 14 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671). This section, it will be noted, clearly recognizes the authority to make transfers and seeks only to impose certain restrictions thereon. The section reads as follows:

"Sec. 14. (a) Notwithstanding the provision of any other law, no military or naval weapon, ship, boat, aircraft, munitions, supplies, or equipment, to which the United States has title, in whole or in part, or which have been contracted for, shall hereafter be transferred, exchanged, sold, or otherwise disposed of in any manner whatsoever unless the Chief of Naval Operations in the case of naval material, and the Chief of Staff of the Army in the case of military material, shall first certify that such material is not essential to the defense of the United States."

Thus to prohibit action by the constitutionally created Commander in Chief, except upon authorization of a statutory officer subordinate in rank, is of questionable constitutionality. However, since the statute requires certification only of matters as to which you would wish, irrespective of the statute, to be satisfied, and as the legislative history of the section indicates that no arbitrary restriction is intended, it seems unnecessary to raise the question of constitutionality which such a provision would otherwise invite.

I am informed that the destroyers involved here are the survivors of a fleet of over 100 built at about the same time and under the same design. During the year 1930, 58 of these were decommissioned with a view toward scrapping and a corresponding number were recommissioned as replacements. Usable material and equipment from the 58 vessels removed from the service were transferred to the recommissioned vessels to recondition and modernize them, and other usable material and equipment were removed and the vessels stripped. They were then stricken from the Navy register, and 50 of them were sold as scrap for prices ranging from \$5,260 to \$6,800 per vessel, and the remaining 8 were used for such purposes as target vessels, experimental construction tests, and temporary barracks. The surviving destroyers now under consideration have been reconditioned and are in service, but all of them are overage, most of them by several years.

In construing this statute in its application to such a situation it is important to note that this subsection as originally proposed in the Senate bill provided that the appropriate staff officer shall first certify that "such material is not essential to and cannot be used in the defense of the United States. Senator BARKLEY and others objected to the subsection as so worded on the ground that it would prevent the release and exchange of surplus or used planes and other supplies for sale to the British, and that it would consequently nullify the provisions of the bill (see sec. 1 of the act of July 2, 1940, H. R. 9850, Public, No. 703) which the Senate had passed several days earlier for that very purpose. Although Senator WALSH stated that he did not think the proposed subsection had that effect, he agreed to strike out the words "and cannot be used." Senator BARKLEY observed that he thought the modified language provided "a much more elastic term." Senator WALSH further stated that he would bear in mind in conference the views of Senator BARKLEY and others, and that he had "no desire or purpose to go beyond the present law, but to have some certificate filed as to whether the property is surplus or not." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 21, 1940, pp. 8831–8832.)

In view of this legislative history it is clear that the Congress did not intend to prevent the certification for transfer, exchange, sale, or disposition of property merely because it is still used or usable or of possible value for future use. The statute does not contemplate mere transactions in scrap, yet exchange or sale except as scrap would hardly be possible if confined to material whose usefulness is entirely gone. It need only be certified as not essential, and "essential," usually the equivalent of vital or indispensable, falls far short of "used" or "usable."

Moreover, as has been indicated, the congressional authorization is not merely of a sale which might imply only a cash transaction. It also authorizes equipment to be "transferred," "exchanged," or "otherwise disposed of"; and in connection with material of this kind for which there is no open market, value is never absolute but only relative—and chiefly related to what may be had in exchange or replacement.

In view of the character of the transactions contemplated, as well as the legislative history, the conclusion is inescapable that the Congress has not sought by section 14 (a) to impose an arbitrary limitation upon the judgment of the highest staff officers as to whether a transfer, exchange, or other disposition of specific items would impair our essential defenses. Specific items must be weighed in relation to our total defense position before and after an exchange or disposition. Any other construction would be a virtual prohibition of any sale, exchange, or disposition of material or supplies so long as they were capable of use, however

ineffective, and such a prohibition obviously was not, and was not intended to be, written into the law.

It is my opinion that in proceeding under section 14 (a) appropriate staff officers may and should consider remaining useful life, strategic importance, obsolescence, and all other factors affecting defense value, not only with respect to what the Government of the United States gives up in any exchange or transfer, but also with respect to what the Government receives. In this situation good business sense is good legal sense.

I, therefore, advise that the appropriate staff officers may, and should, certify under section 14 (a) that ships and material involved in a sale or exchange are not essential to the defense of the United States if in their judgment the consummation of the transaction does not impair or weaken the total defense of the United States, and certainly so where the consummation of the arrangement will strengthen the total defensive position of the Nation.

With specific reference to the proposed agreement with the Government of Great Britain for the acquisition of naval and air bases, it is my opinion that the Chief of Naval Operations may, and should, certify under section 14 (a) that the destroyers involved are not essential to the defense of the United States if in his judgment the exchange of such destroyers for such naval and air bases will strengthen rather than impair the total defense of the United States.

I have previously indicated that in my opinion there is statutory authority for the acquisition of the naval and air bases in exchange for the vessels and material. The question was not more fully treated at that point because dependent upon the statutes above discussed and which required consideration in this section of the opinion. It is to be borne in mind that these statutes clearly recognize and deal with the authority to make dispositions by sale, transfer, exchange, or otherwise; that they do not impose any limitations concerning individuals, corporations, or governments to which such dispositions may be made; and that they do not specify or limit in any manner the consideration which may enter into an exchange. There is no reason whatever for holding that sales may not be made to or exchanges made with a foreign government or that in such a case a treaty is contemplated. This is emphasized when we consider that the transactions in some cases may be quite unimportant, perhaps only dispositions of scrap, and that a domestic buyer (unless restrained by some authorized contract or embargo) would be quite free to dispose of his purchase as he pleased. Furthermore, section 14 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940, supra, was enacted by the Congress in full contemplation of transfers for ultimate delivery to foreign belligerent nations. Possibly it may be said that the authority for exchange of naval vessels and material presupposes the acquisition of something of value to the Navy, or, at least, to the national defense. Certainly I can imply no narrower limitation when the law is wholly silent in this respect. Assuming that there is, however, at least the limitation which I have mentioned, it is fully met in the acquisition of rights to maintain needed bases. And if, as I hold, the statute law authorizes the exchange of vessels and material for other vessels and material, or, equally, for the right to establish bases, it is an inescapable corollary that the statute law also authorizes the acquisition of the ships or material or bases which form the consideration for the exchange.

### III

Whether the statutes of the United States prevent the dispatch to Great Britain, a belligerent power, of the so-called mosquito boats now under construction or the overage destroyers depends upon the interpretation to be placed on section 3 of title V of the act of June 15, 1917 (ch. 30, 40 Stat. 217, 222). This section reads:

"During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war, or converted from a private vessel into a vessel of war, with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation, or to an agent, officer, or citizen of such nation, or with reasonable cause to believe that the said vessel shall or will be employed in the service of any such belligerent nation after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States."

This section must be read in the light of section 2 of the same act and the rules of international law which the Congress states that it was its intention to implement: (H. Rept. No. 30, 65th Cong., 1st sess., p. 9.) So read, it is clear that it is inapplicable to vessels, like the overage destroyers, which were not built, armed, equipped as, or converted into, vessels of war with the intent that they should enter the service of a belligerent. If the section were not so construed, it would render meaningless section 2 of the act which authorizes the President to detain any armed vessel until he is satisfied that it will not engage in hostile operations before it reaches a neutral or belligerent port. The two sections are intelligible and reconcilable only if read in the light of the traditional rules of international law. These are clearly stated by Oppenheim in his work on International Law, fifth edition, volume 2, section 334, pages 574-576:

"Whereas a neutral is in no wise obliged by his duty of impartiality to prevent his subjects from selling armed vessels to the belligerents, such armed vessels being merely contraband of war, a neutral is bound to employ the means at his disposal to prevent his subjects from building, fitting out, or arming, to the order of either belligerent, vessels intended to be used as men-of-war, and to prevent the departure from his jurisdiction of any vessel which,

by order of either belligerent, has been adapted to war-like use. The difference between selling armed vessels to belligerents and building them to order is usually defined in the following way:

"An armed ship, being contraband of war, is in no wise different from other kinds of contraband, provided that she is not manned in a neutral port, so that she can commit hostilities at once after having reached the open sea. A subject of a neutral who builds an armed ship, or arms a merchantman, not to the order of a belligerent, but intending to sell her to a belligerent, does not differ from a manufacturer of arms who intends to sell them to a belligerent. There is nothing to prevent a neutral from allowing his subjects to sell armed vessels, and to deliver them to belligerents, either in a neutral port or in a belligerent port. \* \* \*

"On the other hand, if a subject of a neutral builds armed ships to the order of a belligerent, he prepares the means of naval operations, since the ships, on sailing outside the neutral territorial waters and taking in a crew and ammunition, can at once commit hostilities. Thus, through the carrying out of the order of the belligerent, the neutral territory has been made the base of naval operations; and as the duty of impartiality includes an obligation to prevent either belligerent from making neutral territory the base of military or naval operations, a neutral violates his neutrality by not preventing his subjects from carrying out an order of a belligerent for the building and fitting out of men-of-war. This distinction, although of course logically correct, is hairsplitting. But as, according to the present law, neutral states need not prevent their subjects from supplying arms and ammunition to belligerents, it will probably continue to be drawn."

Viewed in the light of the above, I am of the opinion that this statute does prohibit the release and transfer to the British Government of the so-called mosquito boats now under construction for the United States Navy. If these boats were released to the British Government, it would be legally impossible for that Government to take them out of this country after their completion, since to the extent of such completion at least they would have been built, armed, or equipped with the intent, or with reasonable cause to believe, that they would enter the service of a belligerent after being sent out of the jurisdiction of the United States.

This will not be true, however, with respect to the overage destroyers, since they were clearly not built, armed, or equipped with any such intent or with reasonable cause to believe that they would ever enter the service of a belligerent.

In this connection it has been noted that during the war between Russia and Japan in 1904 and 1905, the German Government permitted the sale to Russia of torpedo boats and also of ocean liners belonging to its auxiliary navy. (See Wheaton's International Law, sixth ed. (Keith), vol. 2, p. 977).

### IV

Accordingly you are respectfully advised:

(a) That the proposed arrangement may be concluded as an Executive agreement, effective without awaiting ratification.

(b) That there is Presidential power to transfer title and possession of the proposed considerations upon certification by appropriate staff officers.

(c) That the dispatch of the so-called mosquito boats would constitute a violation of the statute law of the United States, but with that exception there is no legal obstacle to the consummation of the transaction, in accordance, of course, with the applicable provisions of the Neutrality Act as to delivery.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT H. JACKSON,  
Attorney General.

SEPTEMBER 3, 1940.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

1. Concerning the proposed transfer of destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for naval and air bases, the Attorney General of the United States in an opinion held as follows:

"It is my opinion that the Chief of Naval Operations may, and should, certify under section 14 (a) that such destroyers are not essential to the defense of the United States if in his judgment the exchange of such destroyers for strategic naval and air bases will strengthen rather than impair the total defense of the United States."

2. It is my opinion that an exchange of 50 overage destroyers for suitable naval and air bases on 99-year leases in Newfoundland, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Santa Lucia, Trinidad, Antigua, and in British Guiana will strengthen rather than impair the total defense of the United States. Therefore, I certify that on the basis of such an exchange, and in accordance with the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, the 50 over-age destroyers of the so-called 1,200-ton type are not essential to the defense of the United States.

H. R. STARK,  
Admiral, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the legislative program of today, and following any previous special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

## COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 586.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House Resolution 586

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10132, a bill to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. It shall also be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order any amendment offered by the direction of the Committee on Military Affairs to the bill or committee substitute. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill H. R. 10132 it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 4164 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 10132.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] on the rule, and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, you have heard this rule read. It provides for 2 full days of general debate and after that the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule, and I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] as well as to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and to the House that it has been agreed that if there is a demand for time we can go on this evening until 7 or 8 o'clock and the same understanding will apply as to tomorrow. So nobody will be deprived of being heard on this extremely important legislation.

The rule is a liberal one. It gives the Military Affairs Committee the right to offer amendments which otherwise might be subject to a point of order, and the Military Affairs Committee, I am informed, has agreed to offer an amendment which has been, and is, in dispute, namely the Russell-Overton amendment in a modified form.

The Committee on Rules has granted the rule in this form because the Committee on Military Affairs was unable to agree upon the verbiage of that amendment. However, I was informed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the chairman of the committee, a few moments ago that his committee had agreed upon an amendment which will be acceptable to those who, like myself, believe that capital as well as labor should cooperate with the Government in its defense program.

Section 11 of the Senate bill provides in substance that when any manufacturing plant or facility is necessary for the national defense and is unwilling to enter into fair agreement with the Government such plant or facility can be taken over by the Government but the owner thereof shall not be deprived of his rights and interest therein. I do not consider it conscription any more than I do selective service.

I may say to all those who desire to vote on the Russell amendment and who believe in the principle contained in the amendment that an opportunity will be given them to offer amendments to that amendment when the same is offered, and they will not be denied the right to be heard on the amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. For a brief question.

Mr. RICH. Is not this the first time in the history of our Nation that we have ever had or talked about having conscription in peacetimes?

Mr. SABATH. It is the first time in the history of our Nation that the country is forced for its own protection to act in this manner. This is not a conscription bill. This is a registration, in the first place; selection for training in the service of the country. It is, indeed, unfortunate that in these crucial times a great many honest and well-meaning, sincere, loyal and patriotic men, are being misled.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have been against militarism. I have been against war. I have been against conscription, and I have favored voluntary enlistments. I actually and honestly believed that during the last 3 months we would have a sufficient number of patriotic men in this country who would volunteer their services to be trained in case of actual need. I am obliged to admit that I am disappointed. I am disappointed that such a small number have voluntarily enlisted.

Furthermore, I am disappointed that certain sections of the country have not come forward in the same proportions as others and shown their real patriotism and loyalty to our institutions, to our country, and to our flag. It was because of that fact I came to the conclusion that we must act and must act without delay and pass this selective training service activity legislation.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You made the statement that some people are trying to mislead the people of this Nation. I do not know whether you were referring to me when I asked you if this was a conscription bill or whether you were referring to yourself when you said that it was not a conscription bill. Who was in error?

Mr. SABATH. I still believe this is not a conscription bill, because this bill provides, first, for registration. Then it provides for selective training. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to all others that I think it is much better to train without fighting than to fight without training. [Applause.]

As a matter of fact, a year's training would be a great boon for hundreds of thousands of our young men who now have no training of any kind. The trained personnel required for the maintenance and repair of tanks, airplanes, and mechanized equipment in these training camps will have to be given much the same training and experience as the personnel now trained in their manufacture. So that when these boys come out after their year's training they will be a hundred times better equipped to earn a living in plants that manufacture these materials than when they entered the camps. And they will still be serving their country as skilled workers while at the same time making careers for themselves. This is my candid opinion.

These boys are not being groomed for use in trenches across the seas, but to make them of more use to themselves and therefore to the Nation in case an emergency should arise that would necessitate their services.

Selective service under this bill is intended neither to be militaristic nor disruptive. It does not mean a conscript army, or that the Nation is to be militarized. It does mean a solution of our greatest weakness: insufficient trained men as reserves.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. The public press reported 2 weeks ago that that week broke all peacetime enlistment records. That is, voluntary enlistments. One week ago Thursday in my city of Pittsburgh 411 men enlisted in one day, the greatest in the history of the city.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Is it not a fact that anyone so conscripted in this bill who fails to report is punishable by imprisonment and a fine of not to exceed \$10,000. Is that selective?

Mr. SABATH. No; I do not believe—

Mr. SECCOMBE. It says that in the bill.

Mr. SABATH. I do not believe the gentleman is quite right.

Mr. SECCOMBE. It says that in the bill.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, that may be—

Mr. SECCOMBE. It says that anyone failing to report is punishable by imprisonment and a fine not to exceed \$10,000. That is right on page 31. May be punishable by imprisonment not longer than 5 years.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman does not read the entire section or paragraph.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Well, it is not selective. It is compulsory.

Mr. SABATH. I still disagree with the gentleman and regret I cannot yield further. If the gentleman will read lines 16 to 20, page 31, he will see that his criticism does not apply to "failure to report," but to those who conspire to defeat the purposes of the act.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield any further.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that if each and every Member of this House would be familiar with the activities and what is transpiring, not only abroad but in our own midst and in the adjoining Latin republics, he could not, if he were a real American, refuse to cooperate in every possible way to prepare this Nation for any and every eventuality.

Mr. Speaker, I have here letters and reports—not my own statements but letters, reports, and appeals of men like the following:

General Pershing, the distinguished commanding general of our World War Army.

Maj. George Fielding Eliot, a writer and student of military and European war conditions.

Mr. E. H. Thomas, a leader in the American defense movement, writer on military subjects, and an officer in the World War.

Prof. Sveinbjorn Johnson, professor of law, University of Illinois, an eminent jurist and author of *Pioneers of Freedom*.

Mr. John J. Stonborough, distinguished writer.

Mr. William Allen White, foremost American editor, writer, and lecturer.

Mr. Adolph P. Kern, New Jersey probation officer, who testified before the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the activities of the German-American Bund in having sympathizers enlist in the Signal Corps of the United States Army.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and many others, do not seem to think there is any great need for big preparedness. They should read, in addition to the findings of the above, the joint report of Col. William J. Donovan and Edgar Ansel Mowrer, foremost foreign American newspaper correspondent. Returning recently from a mission abroad on behalf of Secretary of the Navy Knox, they reported that Hitler's success is due to the secret expenditure by the Nazi government annually of \$200,000,000 for purely propaganda purposes outside of Germany. They report: "The explanation of Nazi Germany is conspiracy. Its scope is universal, and its aim, world dominion."

Nazi money is going today into all parts of South and Central America, and is being disbursed today right here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, any unprejudiced, loyal American man or woman reading the views, honest convictions, and recommendations of these men should not, and I believe could not, resist voting for this legislation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Did the gentleman yield any time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

Mr. SABATH. Yes. I yielded 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York, but I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] 5 minutes before I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Not out of my time?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no; no.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Permit the Chair to understand the gentleman. Did the gentleman from Illinois yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 207]

Allen, Pa.	Doughton	Kirwan	Polk
Andresen, A. H.	Douglas	Kleberg	Reed, N. Y.
Arnold	Ellis	Landis	Risk
Barton, N. Y.	Englebright	Lea	Rockefeller
Bates, Mass.	Fay	Lesinski	Sandager
Boehne	Ferguson	Luce	Schaefer, Ill.
Bradley, Mich.	Fernandez	McArdle	Scrugham
Bradley, Pa.	Flaherty	McGranery	Shanley
Brewster	Folger	Maas	Sheridan
Buck	Garrett	Magnuson	Simpson
Buckler, Minn.	Gavagan	Maloney	Smith, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Griffith	Marshall	Somers, N. Y.
Caldwell	Hall, Edwin A.	Martin, Ill.	Starnes, Ala.
Celler	Hall, Leonard W.	Merritt	Sullivan
Chapman	Halleck	Mitchell	Sweeney
Cluett	Hart	Monkiewicz	Taber
Coffee, Wash.	Healey	Murdock, Utah	Taylor
Connery	Hook	Myers	Tenerowicz
Corbett	Jarrett	Nelson	Treadway
Crowe	Jenks, N. H.	Norton	Vreeland
Culkin	Jones, Ohio	O'Brien	Wallgren
Darrow	Jones, Tex.	O'Day	Weaver
Delaney	Kee	Oliver	White, Ohio
Dempsey	Kefauver	Osmers	Wigglesworth
Dies	Keller	O'Toole	Wood
Dingell	Kennedy, Martin	Pfeifer	Woodruff, Mich.
Disney	Keogh	Pierce	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Three hundred and twenty-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include some tables from the War Department, also letters and editorials on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

#### COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the resolution is contrary to the unwritten law of the House. It has been the universal practice, custom, and tradition of the House to have debate fixed by hours. This resolution fixes general debate by days. This is entirely meaningless, because a day may be terminated by a motion that the Committee rise or by adjournment, and for that reason I press my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the resolution is contrary to the unwritten rules of the House in that general debate is fixed by days instead of hours.

In the first place, the point of order comes too late.

In the second place, this is a resolution reported by the Committee on Rules to change the rules of the House, which

is permissible on anything except that which is prohibited by the Constitution.

The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, when the application for this rule was being heard by the Rules Committee, I made the observation that I was somewhat disappointed over the treatment being given the problem in question. In other words, I felt that I saw in the bill an evidence of hesitation, timidity, if not fear; in other words, my quarrel with the bill is not that it goes too far but that it does not go far enough. Personally, I am not greatly interested in a large standing army in peacetime, but I am tremendously interested in a trained manhood, and I favor universal training rather than a draft measure which merely takes care of an emergency. Understand, I am for the bill that your Committee on Military Affairs has reported. I think it very much better than the bill turned out by the Senate, in that it inheres more closely to the original Burke-Wadsworth bill than does the Senate bill.

On the question of the rule, the rule was prepared in the manner requested by the committee reporting the bill. You will observe that it protects against a point of order any amendment offered by the Military Affairs Committee. The consideration that prompted the preparation of the rule in that form was to make possible the consideration of the Overton-Russell amendment to the Senate bill; in other words, by writing the rule as it is reported control of that question rests in the hands of the Committee on Military Affairs. I understand that the committee assembled this morning and reported something of a compromise, or, at least, reported a modified Overton-Russell amendment which may or may not satisfy those interested in the consideration of the Russell-Overton amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. COX. With pleasure.

Mr. TARVER. In the event the committee offers the modified language instead of the Russell-Overton amendment, will it not be in order for any Member of the House, whether on the Military Affairs Committee or not, to offer any substitute which is relevant to the committee amendment?

Mr. COX. I have not consulted the Parliamentarian and am not in position to give the gentleman a reply upon which he could rely. In my opinion, however, if offered as a substitute, it would still be subject to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us, in the event the rule is adopted, is, What are we prepared to do in the way of national defense, in the way of building a war machine adequate to meet all comers from whatever source? I cannot believe that there is any considerable percentage of the membership of this House that finds it possible in his heart, in his understanding of the problem, to oppose this bill.

There is a host of Communist bums and bohunks and honestly misguided people crowded in here this morning to influence Congress. I would like to say to them that this is America, and it is worth saving, and that by the help of God we are going to protect and save it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. It appears from the language of the rule that the Committee on Military Affairs will be permitted to offer amendments which are not germane to the bill. Assuming that the Committee on Military Affairs does offer such an amendment dealing with the subject matter of what is commonly referred to as the Russell-Overton amendment to the Senate bill, would it or not then be in order for other Members of the House to offer amendments to the committee amendment or substitutes for the committee amendment if those substitutes or amendments to the committee amendment were relevant to the committee amendment, although not relevant to the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair regrets the confusion was such the Chair was unable to understand the gentleman's inquiry. Will the gentleman restate his proposition?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the question which I am trying to have clarified is this: It has been stated by Members that the Committee on Military Affairs, as authorized to do under the language of the pending rule, will offer substitute language for what is commonly known as the Russell-Overton amendment adopted in the Senate. No Member of the House could offer a substitute, because it would not be relevant to the bill, and under the rule an amendment not relevant to the bill could not be offered by anyone except the Committee on Military Affairs. Assuming that the Committee on Military Affairs does offer such amendment, may Members of the House then offer amendments to the committee amendment or substitutes for the committee amendment which are relevant to the committee amendment but which would not be relevant to the bill without the committee amendment?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and, earlier in the day, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], both of whom are interested in this subject, raised the same point that the gentleman from Georgia now raises. Since that time I have consulted with the Speaker and the Parliamentarian, and I have made some investigation of the rules and precedents of the House. Under the amendment that the committee will offer in reference to this matter of drafting industry, it is my opinion, and the opinion of those with whom I have consulted, that relevant amendments to that would be in order. It is my opinion that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole would in all probability so hold.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman from Texas, but I wonder if that opinion of the gentleman from Texas may be confirmed by the Chair?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, of course, I cannot assure the gentleman from Georgia what the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will do, but I think the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will in all probability consult with the same people I have and will in all probability arrive at the same conclusion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In answer to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] the Chair may say that while he does not feel it would be proper to undertake to make a decision now which would bind the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when such question is presented, the present occupant of the chair is of the opinion that amendments offered by authority of the Committee on Military Affairs would be subject to germane amendments offered by Members of the House.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOREN. I may put it in the form of a question. I want to know if the statement the Chair has just made would apply to an amendment which might be offered in the form of a substitute to the committee amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A substitute is an amendment. The present occupant of the chair does not feel compelled to further amplify or to further express an opinion on these questions that may properly be raised in the Committee of the Whole and which will be passed upon by the Chairman of that Committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my previous assurance, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any valid opposition to the pending rule. I have the utmost confidence in and regard for the word of the majority leader of this House and he has been quoted as stating that, if necessary in order to give more debate on this highly important issue, the House

could sit until 8 o'clock at night. In that way the Members of the House may have more than 12 hours general debate. In the next 2 days they may actually have 14 or 15 hours of general debate, and I am quite sure that the majority leader will do everything in his power to see that all possible debate is permitted for Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I think it was most unfortunate and most regrettable that at the outset of the debate on this highly important issue of peacetime conscription, one as far reaching as any that we have discussed in the House for many years, a gentleman of the House should take the floor and accuse those who have come here to Washington in opposition to this bill, free sovereign American citizens who have come here under their constitutional rights of assembly and petition, of being "lousy bums." [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will be debated upon a high plane, worthy of the great traditions of the House of Representatives. This is a measure that for good or evil may affect the destiny of our country and our free institutions; yes, even our republican form of government.

Peacetime conscription is un-American, undemocratic, and un-republican and a subversion of the ancient and fixed principles of a free people.

Mr. Speaker, those are not my words. Those words were written into the Democratic national platform in 1900.

Peacetime conscription is bound to be a dangerous and disastrous departure from American ideals and traditions. It is an evil and ruinous experiment that will create a huge military machine or Frankenstein that will devour our free institutions and substitute militarism and autocracy in America.

It will encourage President Roosevelt, Messrs. Knox and Stimson, Ambassador Bullitt, and other interventionists to stick their noses in the eternal disputes and wars of the Old World.

Peacetime conscription in America is the direct road to Hitlerism, dictatorship, and national socialism. If we adopt peacetime conscription, we are merely copying Nazi methods and ideology.

We begin by conscripting the lives of our youth, and we end by conscripting property, industry, the almighty dollar, and, even more important, the civil rights and liberties of the American people. This is bringing Hitlerism, totalitarianism, and national socialism to America.

I had never expected to see the day when the elected representatives of the people, entrusted by the American wage earners and farmers to protect their rights and liberties, would vote for peacetime conscription, a betrayal of our free institutions and representative government.

This bill imposes upon our country, without the consent of the people, a military and economic system that is nothing less than the national socialism of Nazi Germany. Adolf Hitler, the dreaded dictator and war lord of Europe, must be laughing up his sleeve as he sees America aping his totalitarian methods, and following his goose steps on the road to dictatorship, militarism, and national socialism.

If peacetime conscription is adopted, we will have, by a vote of Congress, imported the very essence of nazi-ism and Hitlerism into the United States. "A rose by any other name smells as sweet." A military and economic dictator by any other name is just as odious and repugnant to the free people of America and their way of life.

Old Man Mars must be in a joyous mood as he gazes on our steady march to militarism and war.

Our answer to the dictator nations is to make democracy work in America, through the volunteer system, and not subvert it with a military dictatorship or by the European conscription and war system.

We must give the American volunteer system a chance before resorting to any form of military conscription in time of peace, and before regimenting American youth into a huge military machine after the pattern of foreign dictators.

Conscription in peace is not the American way, but the road to militarism, dictatorship, and war.

Whom do we fear? Do we fear Hitler, who seems afraid to attack England over 20 miles of sea, when he would have 3,000 miles to cross over here? That is preposterous, when we have the greatest Navy in the world, seven times larger than the German Navy, or that we should fear Hitler and Mussolini combined, to make it necessary to rush in and conscript the American youth.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am afraid the gentleman is a little optimistic. If we give our Navy away, how are we going to stop Germany from coming over here?

Mr. FISH. I shall discuss that later on.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Has anybody specifically described the emergency which warrants such a subversive step as conscription? The only definition of emergency which we have had so far has been airplane timetables and generalities from the President.

Can anybody on this committee or the Committee on Rules or in any department of the United States specifically define the emergency that warrants militarization of American youth?

Mr. FISH. I suppose in their own time someone will try to answer that question, but I will say to the gentleman that the question propounded is the same propounded by Mr. William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and it should not be necessary for me to answer it. The question should be answered by the President of the United States, who so far has failed to do so.

No thinking American believes that Hitler, who cannot cross 20 miles of sea to England, can with bad weather coming on attack America in the next 30, 60, or 90 days, and no American believes that any airplane has ever been invented that can fly from Germany to New York, and drop bombs and get back to its own base.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. COX. Has not the gentleman been voting for all these appropriations intended to strengthen the national defense?

Mr. FISH. Certainly. I believe in protecting America.

Mr. COX. What would the gentleman do with this machine that is in the building without the men to run it?

Mr. FISH. Because I believe, sincerely and honestly, that you can get all the volunteers you want in America at the present time. [Applause.] That is the reason I am so bitterly opposed to this revolutionary departure of trying to impose conscription in peacetime when we can get all the volunteers we want.

Mr. COX. With regard to the group crowded in Washington this morning, for whom the gentleman expressed such great solicitude, under the volunteer system does the gentleman believe we will get one of them in the Army? [Applause.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; you will.

Mr. FISH. I do not know about what group the gentleman is talking. If the gentleman is talking about members of the American Federation of Labor, I may say to the gentleman that I believe the members of the American Federation of Labor are as loyal as any group in America or as the gentleman himself.

Mr. COX. I am talking about the 800 communistic bums that came in on the train this morning from the gentleman's home State. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman is referring to Communists, I wish the gentleman would so state.

Mr. COX. Is not the town full of Communists this morning?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman well knows that I do not traffic with the Communists, and do not propose to stand here and defend Communists.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that we now have in the armed forces of the country over 700,000 men, and not enough equipment to take care of 100,000 of them?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is almost correct. We have 1,000,000 men in our armed forces, or will have in another few weeks. This includes, of course, the 200,000 men in the Navy, so it amounts to 1,000,000 in our armed forces. In the Army it is perfectly true that we will not have proper equipment for at least 6 months, and maybe a year, or modern weapons to equip an army of 700,000 men, to say nothing of a million.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. With reference to the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], I believe his language should be expunged from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under a resolution.

Mr. COX. Offer a resolution and have a vote on it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Many of those who are now in Washington opposing this bill come from the State of Wisconsin and other States in the Union and did not wait to be drafted during the World War, but enlisted and went overseas and are now suffering from battle casualties received in the service of our country. I for one do not intend to remain silent when the gentleman from Georgia calls these men "bums", "communistic bums", or "lousy bums."

Mr. COX. Let the gentleman offer his resolution and have a vote of the House.

Mr. FISH. I do not know what the gentleman himself did in the last war. It might be interesting to find that out.

Mr. COX. To whom does the gentleman refer?

Mr. FISH. I am referring to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman proud of the record he has ever made?

Mr. FISH. I am asking whether the gentleman was drafted or served in the last war.

Mr. COX. I did not serve in the last war because I was on the bench. It has been the regret of my life that I did not resign and go to war.

Mr. FISH. That is what I thought. I made a good guess. [Applause.] Oh, I seem always to find that those who are proposing to draft others and send them to war did not serve in the World War themselves. [Applause.]

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Is it not true that the reason these men, who refuse the volunteer system, do so is that they know it will work?

Mr. FISH. That is my honest and sincere belief, and I believe that is what we have to thrash out in the House. I believe the American people and the House of Representatives itself want to give the volunteer system a chance.

When the time comes, if I may be permitted to do so, I propose to offer the so-called Hayden amendment which lost by 2 votes in the Senate, which requires giving the volunteer system 60 days to raise 400,000 men. I believe we can do that when you reduce the enlistment period to 1 year and pay the enlistees \$30 a month.

Mr. ENGEL and Mr. SOUTH rose.

Mr. FISH. I am sorry I cannot yield now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield now. I have been very liberal in yielding.

All history, and particularly contemporary, proves that placing the power of life and livelihood in the hands of any one man is the road to dictatorship and totalitarianism. I am bitterly opposed to both and shall resist peacetime conscription until every effort has been made to exhaust the advantages of the American volunteer system under which

our rights and liberties as a free people have been preserved. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I propose now to read a letter signed by Milton A. Reckord, a major general in command of the Twenty-ninth National Guard Division, written to me on August 29:

STATE OF MARYLAND, MILITARY DEPARTMENT,  
Annapolis, August 29, 1940.

The Honorable HAMILTON FISH,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FISH: I have just read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 28 your statement on the floor of the House with respect to an article which recently appeared in the Washington Times-Herald by an anonymous writer. I wish to thank you for the statement you made with respect to this matter and to say that, as the Commanding General of the Twenty-ninth Division, I subscribe absolutely to everything you said with the one exception that you stated the anonymous writer was a member of the Twenty-ninth Division. This is not the fact, the man is supposed to be a member of an anti-aircraft regiment of the District of Columbia National Guard which regiment belongs in the Corps or Army group and not in any division.

With respect to the article, a careful reading of same indicated to me that it may have been written for the specific purpose of disparaging the National Guard in the eyes of Congress and the people of the United States at this time. It was written in such a vein and couched in such terms as to indicate to me that the anonymous writer was not a normal, ordinary, private soldier, but the article has all the earmarks of having been written by someone planted for the purpose of doing injury to the National Guard.

I sincerely thank you in the name of the entire National Guard for the splendid statement you made in defense of this component of the Army.

With regards, I am,  
Very truly yours,

MILTON A. RECKORD,  
Major General, Maryland National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, why all this haste to force conscription upon America? The dominions of Great Britain have not got conscription and they have been in the war for 1 year. South Africa has no conscription, and Australia has likewise none. Canada has recently put into effect a modified form of conscription—not like this—calling for a year's service, but for 30 days' service as a home guard. That is all the British dominions have done; and I would like to know also whom we are afraid of. Are Americans craven and cowardly? Are we afraid of the very shadow of Hitler? Do we honestly think that Mussolini and Hitler will be over here tomorrow morning or in 30 days; that we should rush in ahead of the dominions; ahead of those nations that are at war, and force conscription upon America for 5 years in time of peace? I would vote for it in a minute if I thought we needed it. I believe in making America invincible on sea, in the air, and on land, but I am convinced that we will get all the men we want, even to 1,000,000, by the volunteer system if we ask for them and provide for 1-year enlistments.

We will be told, "This is not un-American; why George Washington advocated it." In the midst of this war hysteria anything will be told to you. George Washington did mention the draft, because in those days our militia served for 30 days, 60 days, and 90 days, and went home in the midst of a battle, and, naturally, there was some talk of the draft, but it has never been put into effect in time of peace. It was not put into effect even in the entire Revolutionary War, in spite of the fact that the militia served for 30 or 60 days and when there was some reason for it. I venture to predict that George Washington will be drawn into the debate as one of the reasons we should have peacetime conscription.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point for a question?

Mr. FISH. For a brief question; yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The President points out as a cogent reason why we should have conscription that we are soft. Now, I realize the gentleman has had a lot of experience in the Army as a soldier. How long would it take to harden a soft man by training?

Mr. FISH. Let me tell the gentleman—and I hope the whole House will listen carefully, whether you are for con-

scription or whether you are against conscription—the American youth, the American soldier, properly trained and properly armed, is equal to the best soldier in the world today.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. FISH. I have only 5 minutes, but I yield briefly.

Mr. ENGEL. I heard the report over the radio last week that the air force had stopped taking enlistments because they were getting the men for their ground force faster than they could equip them. Has the gentleman verified that?

Mr. FISH. That is correct.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I would like to yield, but I just cannot yield farther.

Mr. Speaker, our forefathers came over to this country to escape militarism and to maintain and safeguard here their own civil rights. This destroys them. This conscription not only breeds militarism and autocracy, but it actually destroys the civil rights of the American people, and I repeat that it is a step to dictatorship, militarism, Hitlerism, and national socialism.

If you want that in America and if the American people want it they have a right to have it, but let the American people know what they are getting when they get peacetime conscription of the soldiers and of property and of wealth.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield and this is the last time I will yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I think the gentleman is making a very fine speech and I agree with him heartily, but how can the gentleman explain how he would differ with the standard bearer of the Republican Party, Mr. Willkie, on this question? [Laughter.]

Mr. FISH. Well [laughter], I was going to say that I would leave that to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] to answer. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that President Roosevelt saw fit to send in his message today about the transfer or exchange of 50 destroyers when we were considering peacetime conscription in the House; but I feel compelled, in the few remaining minutes at my disposal, as a Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and not of the Military Affairs Committee, to make certain definite observations.

In the first place, the act of the President usurps the powers of the Congress. It violates the laws of the United States and of international law and is virtually an act of war.

I do not believe, however, that Germany will take it as such, only because she does not want to or that it does not suit her present convenience. Certainly, under international law, this is an act of war, and certainly the powers of Congress have been usurped by the President by taking away our constitutional power to declare war. The answer is in the hands of Hitler, not in the hands of the Congress of the United States or the American people. That time has gone by. Under every principle of international law and under a specific provision in the Hague convention, signed by Germany and the United States against the transfer of warships directly or indirectly to belligerent nations, Hitler would be perfectly within international law to declare war on us tomorrow. So, actually, this act of the President, whether it is humanitarian or whether it is in the interest of our country or not, violates the law of the land, international law, treaty agreements, and is in open defiance of the Constitution which gives Congress the sole right to declare war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I am not fearful—at the present time, at least—that Hitler, being involved with England, can attack or attempt to invade the United States, but I am seriously worried over the fact that certain interventionists, led by President Roosevelt and many others in high official places, are seeking, and have been seeking for the past year, to put the United States into war. To my mind, that is the single greatest issue in America. It transcends all party lines, Democrat and Republican, and,

so far as I am concerned, I propose to do everything in my power to keep the United States of America out of all foreign wars. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it proper for a Member on the floor to refer to our guests as "bums"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COX. If that is offensive to anybody I will gladly withdraw it, with the permission of the House. I do not want to offend anybody.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I fear that what I may attempt to say will possibly prove disappointing after we have had such lively debate on the merits of this bill.

My sole purpose in taking this time is to attempt to clarify the question of the so-called Overton amendment and the Smith amendment, and with reference to the parliamentary situation thereto.

This rule is an open rule. It is more than an open rule, because it provides that an amendment may be offered by the Committee on Military Affairs, which otherwise would not be germane and therefore could not be offered. There is considerable division of opinion on the merit of the so-called Overton-Russell amendment, and an amendment that I understand the Committee on Military Affairs of the House has adopted, but for the life of me I cannot understand how anybody would say to the young manhood of this country, "We are going to conscript you and take you into cantonments and out of your civil life, but we are not going to make industry come up to the lick log."

Nobody has ever accused me of being wild or radical. Certainly I have no desire to play politics nor appear demagogic upon this question, but I am appealing to your sense of justice and fairness. The object sought is the preparedness of this country. We all agree that we ought to be prepared. We do not know whether we are going to need an army. We do not know whether we are going to need these munitions or not, but we do know one thing, that it is better to have them and not have to use them than to need them and not have them.

Therefore we must be prepared. Now, we saw the sad spectacle, and nobody can successfully deny this, of industry in some isolated instances in the past 30 days refusing to take war contracts and to turn out these war materials, simply because they were not satisfied with the profits which they were going to make. What I am getting at is this—

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. In just a moment. Let me clarify this. When the rule was applied for by the Military Affairs Committee to the Rules Committee, I espoused the cause of this so-called Overton-Russell amendment, and I think I had something to do with the provision being written into that rule that the Military Affairs Committee could offer such an amendment. We are in the position that if the Military Affairs Committee does not offer that amendment nobody in the House can offer it, under the provisions of the rule.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. In just a moment, if the gentleman will let me proceed.

Anticipating that I had prepared an amendment to this rule which I was going to ask you to adopt making such an amendment in order, I understand, however, that an amendment has been adopted by the Military Affairs Committee and that it will be offered by the chairman of the committee, and I now yield to him.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows what I told him in conference recently. I am one of those who never refuses to do what my committee directs me to do, and I will not fail in this instance.

Mr. KNUTSON. What is it, may I ask the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Mississippi yielded to me. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield that I may reply?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. That I am to offer the amendment agreed upon as a substitute for the Russell-Overton amendment. This the House Committee on Military Affairs directed me to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs for that assurance. I knew it was not necessary, but it is very well to have it of record. I may say further that I read that amendment this morning. In my humble judgment, it is an improvement over the Overton-Russell amendment; and when it is offered I hope the House will adopt the committee substitute. I think it is a fair and just proposition that ought to be adopted. I am for the total and necessary preparation of this country. I believe that in that preparation the manpower, the industrial power, the labor power, and the power of capital should all be called upon to bear their proportionate share of the burden. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today the Governments of Great Britain and of France declared war upon Germany. Today, just 1 year later, the Government of the United States has declared war upon Germany; and make no mistake about that.

In 1917 this Congress enacted a statute that reads:

During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war \* \* \* with any intent or under any agreement \* \* \* that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation \* \* \* after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is the positive statutory law of this land enacted by this body and approved by President Wilson on June 15, 1917; and yet we are told by the President of the United States today that in exchange for naval and air bases leased by the Government of Great Britain to this country for 99 years we shall immediately transfer to them 50 over-age destroyers. This constitutes an act of war. No amount of sophistry can conceal the clear, cold fact.

Two months ago this Congress, in passing the Defense Act, said that "nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or modify" the statute I have just quoted.

Only 1 month ago this Congress passed another bill, which stated:

No vessel, ship, or boat \* \* \* now in the United States Navy or being built or hereafter built therefor shall be disposed of, by sale or otherwise, or be chartered or scrapped, except as now provided by law.

In addition to these acts of Congress, Mr. Speaker, in 1907 this Government of ours signed along with other governments in all good faith the treaty at the Hague Convention that specifically provided that—

The supply in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever, is forbidden.

Suppose we were at war with Great Britain and that the German Reich, a country neutral in name if not in fact, would open her arsenals and furnish our enemy with planes, ships, and guns. Does anyone think for a moment that the Government of the United States would not immediately consider that act by Germany an act of war? We would. And what would we naturally do about it? We would declare war on that government if we felt strong enough to triumph, and if for strategic reasons we withheld the declaration, we would at least carry a grudge in our minds and hearts for a settlement at some future date.

Since the present war began a year ago, the Government of the United States called a conference at Panama last

October. The American Republics then agreed in condemning the arming or fitting out of ships to be employed in the service of one of the belligerents in Europe's war. If some South American republic should suddenly turn over its warships to Germany, I dare say the United States of America would be heard from. We always have preached that treaties are sacred covenants to be faithfully kept, and it is high time that we practice what we preach. No man is better than his word. The same is true of any nation. This Government today has violated not only international jurisprudence and every rule of fair play as it applies to all nations, but it has actually violated positive statutory laws passed by this Congress. [Applause.]

We all know that Congress and Congress alone has the power to declare war, yet by circumvention, by circumlocution, and by surreption, by setting up a strange device the President of the United States in the first part of June of this year transferred to the Allied Powers our latest type of airplanes, usable Army rifles, and other war materials which British Prime Minister Churchill said 2 weeks ago today had arrived safely in Britain over secret sea lanes—600,000 Lee-Enfield rifles, over 500 75-millimeter French guns, and thousands of rounds of ammunition. In the Washington Post, Wednesday, August 21, 1940, page 6, column 3, reporting Churchill's confident report to Commons, the Prime Minister said:

We have ferried across the Atlantic, thanks to our friends over there, an immense mass of munitions of all kinds: Cannon, rifles, machine guns, cartridges, and shells, all safely landed without the loss of a gun or a round.

By what stratagem was this accomplished? The Neutrality Act forbids sale by the Government of the United States of its airplanes, munitions, and implements of war to a belligerent nation but does not prohibit the sale of these weapons on a cash and carry basis by an individual or a corporation. So, the President, in order to evade the letter of the law, but in clear violation of the spirit of the Neutrality Act, immediately turned our latest airplanes purchased by our Government back to the manufacturers who in turn sold them immediately to Great Britain in exchange for other planes to be delivered at a later date to our Government. The sale of rifles, guns, munitions, and now our destroyers to a belligerent is based upon a statute enacted in time of peace permitting the Military Establishment to sell to any foreign government with whom we were at peace on a certain date surplus munitions and outmoded war materials for which we had no other market. Of course, when this Act was passed by Congress no one ever dreamed that the President would use it as a pretext for opening our country's arsenals to furnish a belligerent with war materials in any conflict.

It seems strange that at this particular time, when our national defense is shamefully inadequate and at the moment when responsible authorities inform us that we are in dire need of tanks, ships, planes, and other weapons of war that this Government should be sending planes, guns, ammunition, and now ships to one party in a war in which we have hypocritically declared ourselves to be neutral. It makes no difference where our sympathies lie in the present conflict. The thing that should concern Americans most is what the result of our actions will be. The moment we send these destroyers to Great Britain we have committed an act of war against Germany and must realize that fact. Are we willing to back it up with our blood? We must go all the way. One cannot be halfway in war and half out. It would be interesting to know just who is financing the page-full advertisements in our newspapers urging aid for the Allies just short of war. This propaganda has received the President's endorsement, although he is the one person who talked more about neutrality in this country than any other.

It should be remembered by those Anglophiles who try to justify the President's action on the basis that it gives our Government certain naval and air bases in British possessions that we are given only a lease on these possessions, and our Government will have "to compensate the owners of private

property for loss by expropriation or damage arising out of the establishment of the bases and facilities in question." No doubt the United States will spend millions of dollars improving these British possessions where our bases are located, and at the end of 99 years the lease expires and all the improvements made by us will revert to our dear and generous friend. Of course, Great Britain never thought of offering us these privileges as part payment on her last war debt to us. She must have destroyers in return for this privilege of protecting her islands and possessions in the Western Hemisphere as well as ourselves, and although the destroyers we furnished are valuable and will be useful to Britain in her dire emergency, it is not the destroyers she wants half as much as the commitment of the United States as her ally in this present conflict. Britain still expects every American to do his duty, and step by step we are being gradually but surely led down the path into this war.

Mr. Speaker, since when could the President of the United States negotiate treaties with foreign powers without those treaties being ratified by the United States Senate? Since when could the President outwit the law and lead us into war without a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States? Since when have we ceased to be a republic and become a totalitarian state? Let every Member of this body keep constantly in mind that he took an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution against all enemies, domestic as well as foreign.

The other evening Mr. Ickes, in attempting to answer the acceptance speech of Mr. Willkie, stated that the President of the United States could not adjourn the Battle of Britain to discuss and debate great domestic issues and vital immediate problems that confront us in this campaign. It would seem that those at the head of our Government today are more interested in fighting the Battle of Britain than they are in fighting the battle of America. We as representatives of the American people must never forget that our first duty is to our own country and to its citizens. May we never forget the words of immortal Jefferson, the founder and patron saint of the Democratic Party, when he said:

I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take an active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal war.

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Is this conscription bill for defense or war?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray to God that the gentleman from Missouri is wrong; in fact, I know he is wrong. What has been done by the President has the approval of the American people, and it is done for the protection of America. [Applause.] It is in the interests of our country and its institutions.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield now.

As to treaties, I know that the gentleman from Missouri realizes that every treaty of which he speaks has been violated by the very man who makes it necessary and mandatory for us to prepare against his wild dreams of some day in the near future attacking America, if not directly, then indirectly.

Mr. Speaker, consider what happened to Austria, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Poland, and all the other countries, including France and Great Britain. They all believed it was not necessary to arm. They took Hitler's word and assurance that there was to be no danger and that he would not attempt to deprive the people of these various countries of their freedom and their liberty. I feel that every act of our President is in the direction of preserving our democratic form of government, our freedom, and our liberty.

I regret exceedingly that my colleague from Georgia made—I know unintentionally—the remark which was properly objected to. I am mighty pleased to know that he is going to withdraw that remark from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill, I am for the resolution, but I know that there are thousands and thousands of honest men and sincere women who fear that this may involve us in war. They are opposed to war; however, unfortunately, they do not realize the danger that confronts America.

I have read the statements of both leaders of labor and I may say that they are justified in demanding, if this bill is called conscription and will conscript them, that we should also conscript capital. [Applause.] But there is nothing in this bill that provides for conscription. It only provides that where people refuse to accept orders to do work needed by the Government, the War Department, the Navy Department, or any other department may have the right to take over their property, not without pay nor without compensation, but on some equitable basis, so that the Government may utilize their factories for the production of needed defense material. This is merely to enable the Government to hold the whip hand over any greedy industrialists who might prove unpatriotic enough not to be willing to cooperate.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Suppose the Congress passes this bill, does the passage of this bill ipso facto operate to conscript a single person?

Mr. SABATH. No. As I stated, it means first, the registration of these men.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Let me complete my statement. Is it not a fact that the bill if passed simply authorizes the President of the United States with certain limitations to induct into training and service any number of persons registered and found qualified to serve, and is it not discretionary with the President of the United States whether or not any one or up to 900,000, as provided by the Senate bill, may be put into service?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman's question explains the matter thoroughly and better than I could explain it. I thank the gentleman from Montana for calling my attention to it.

Mr. Speaker, also I am pleased that the majority leader as well as the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs have substantiated the assurance I originally gave the House that there would be no effort or parliamentary move to deprive any Member from being heard on this extremely important legislation of such moment to the Congress and the country. At the same time there is the assurance that the Committee on Military Affairs will offer a substitute for the Russell-Overton amendment which, under the construction of the Chair as well as the majority leader, will be open to amendment. Had that not been agreed upon I would not have yielded to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] to obtain an explicit assurance that it would be in order, because I believe as I have frequently stated that capital as well as labor should serve the Nation in time of war.

Mr. Speaker, going back to labor, I believe that American labor has demonstrated and will demonstrate again that it is loyal, that it is patriotic, that it is ready and willing at all times to serve the Nation; therefore any attack upon it is unjustified. We do not hear any attack from the Manufacturers' Association or other industrial leaders on the proposal to have our young men register for training; no, they are attacking and assailing only those provisions of the bill which they claim will conscript property. There is not a word of protest coming from them about having our boys go into training. But they are trying desperately to make the people believe they have been discriminated against and that there is some proposal here to take their properties away from them en masse, without any reason at all. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the New York Times of Sunday, which shows that the industries for the last 4 months have paid dividends totaling \$2,373,000,000 in 8 months. Does that show that American industries have been discriminated

against or that any property has been taken away from them? The industries are being protected; so is labor, and I feel this legislation will not only protect labor and industry, but will protect America and the democracy which we so dearly cherish, that it will preserve our freedom and liberty of which 10 nations have already been deprived. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 224, noes 14.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10132) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsive military training; and pending that disposition of that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a very brief statement at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the rule against which some complaint has been made with respect to the number of hours or the lack of hours of debate has been adopted. Being charged under the rule with the responsibility of handling the time on this side of the House, I would like to assure my colleagues on both sides of the House that, although I am a tired man, having worked nearly day and night for some time, I shall be happy to stay here this evening for general debate until any reasonable hour, in fact to an unreasonable hour, if someone wishes to speak.

It is not going to be my disposition to curtail general debate on this bill. Inasmuch as 2 days have been set for general debate, I want all those who are interested to have all the hours they can get for debate today and tomorrow.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman says he is willing to stay here all night if necessary. When we have such important legislation before the House, why not make the debate not an endurance test but an intelligent discussion engaged in by men who are not kept here from early morning until late at night and tired out? You can probably carry this bill without using an endurance test.

Mr. MAY. I am assuming that those who discuss this bill will do so intelligently. I am not assuming the function or province of acting for the Committee on Rules. They have performed their duty, and I shall follow their direction. What I meant was that I want to be liberal with everybody with regard to this debate.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Will not the gentleman ask unanimous consent before we go into Committee that there may be published in today's RECORD the committee substitute for the Russell-Overton amendment, and other committee amendments, so that all the Members can be advised as to its contents?

Mr. MAY. I shall be happy to do that, and I do so now, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the committee amendments, referred to in the debate,

adopted by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

The committee amendment referred to follows:

At the end of section 3, insert "Provided, That nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to persons inducted or enlisted as provided herein or to members of the reserve components of the land and naval forces of the United States below the grade of captain now on or hereafter placed on any type of active duty, which persons and members were, prior to their induction or enlistment, or being placed on active duty, receiving compensation from such person, firm, or corporation, during the time they are in training and service hereunder or on active duty under the provisions of law."

Amend H. R. 10132 by striking out on page 28, all of lines 19 to 24 inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) shall be considered during the period of service in such forces as on furlough or leave of absence; and shall be so restored without loss of seniority; and shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer at the time of being inducted into such forces; and shall not be discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration."

On page 34 at the end of section 11 insert:

"The President is empowered, through the head of the War Department or the Navy Department of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry.

"Compliance with all such orders for products or material shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof, and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, owning or operating any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the Army or Navy, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment, who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition, or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment, as ordered by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, or who shall refuse to furnish such arms, ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or other supplies or equipment, at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, then, and in either such case, the President, through the head of the War or Navy Departments of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants, and through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the Army or Navy to manufacture therein such product or material as may be required, and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding \$50,000.

"The compensation to be paid to any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for its products or material, or as rental for use of any manufacturing plant while used by the United States, shall be fair and just: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to render inapplicable existing State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, and employment standards of the employees in such plant."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10132, with Mr. WARREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

On motion of Mr. MAY, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half of the time for general debate to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], minority ranking member of the House Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield myself 30 minutes.

I am very happy indeed to note that we have a full gallery of people from this city and many sections of the country today, and I hope they will remain here and that others will come to listen to this debate. That is one of the great beauties of a democracy such as we have, and which we all want to serve. I am confident, however, that those in the gallery will be orderly and respectful in their attention to the proceedings of the House, and I am sure it is unnecessary for me to say that the Members of the House will at all times be courteous and respectful to each other and to those in the gallery.

If the Committee will tolerate me with the necessary apology, I should like to make a brief statement of the various provisions of the bill we have under discussion. I shall not undertake to take up the time necessary to go into detail in the discussion of the provisions of every section of the bill, because the bill contains several sections, but I shall undertake to point out and call attention to those sections which I regard as of vital importance and that are somewhat controversial.

Section 1 of the bill provides nothing other than a declaration of policy by the Congress, and this policy as declared in section 1 is that a system of selective military training and service is essential to the preservation of our institutions of government. In addition, it states that the responsibilities for service rest alike upon all of us without discrimination.

I am sure I shall be perfectly fair and impartial in my explanation of these sections; and when I have completed this explanation as best I can—and I assure you it will not be perfect—I shall be happy to answer a reasonable number of questions within the time I have allotted to me.

I regard this bill as perhaps the most important measure that has been before the American Congress in the last 50 years, and that is going back quite a distance.

Section 2 of the bill provides that all male citizens of the United States and all male aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, and who are between the ages of 21 and 45 years, shall be subject to registration and to military service in certain instances.

Section 3 provides the term of training which shall be required of those who are registered and inducted into the service for training, and I should like to emphasize right here and now that this is a training bill for the purpose of training men for any eventuality that may require military service.

Of course, it is designated and termed a compulsory military training bill, and in a certain sense it is compulsory, but may I say that I look upon this legislation in this way—that if I have a son in whom I am interested and want to educate him and send him to school, he first enters the grades, then the high school, then the college, and then takes post-graduate courses, for the purpose of informing himself and training his mind, his faculties, and his abilities, so that he may meet the problems of civil life and society.

In this instance we are taking from the population of this country, within certain ages and certain groups, a certain number of men whom we expect to train for the protection of themselves and their own bodies and their lives, because a trained soldier is more capable of protecting himself than an untrained soldier. When I make this statement I feel that I am speaking in the name of more than 60 percent of those who fell in Flanders fields in the great World War, because it was lack of training very largely that prevented them from being able to escape death and take care of themselves.

I am sure that Members of this House, impartial as they are and patriotic as everyone is, when the time comes for

final disposition of this question will not allow anything save and except their consciousness of duty and responsibility as American representatives to control them in their votes on this measure.

Now, of course, I would like to go into detail about these sections and I would like to explain them more in detail, but during the debate questions will be asked about them and they will be explained in full.

Section 3 provides for the base pay and a pay schedule for all of those who are inducted into the service under the provisions of this bill. It raises the base pay of the enrollees or those who are inducted and all other members of the Regular Army and of our armed services that are not so raised, to \$30 base pay, the same as that which exists in the Navy.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman discuss subsection (c) on page 17, which places the draftee into the service for 10 years after his discharge?

Mr. MAY. I have not yet reached that section and I am taking this up section by section.

Mr. ENGEL. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I thought he had passed that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on section 3?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Will that apply also to the volunteer man and will he get \$30 pay?

Mr. MAY. Certainly, he will.

Mr. DONDERO. The same as the Regular Army or the National Guard?

Mr. MAY. That is right, and there is a provision in this bill that authorizes volunteers.

Section 3 (c) goes into detail and gives figures and schedules with respect to pay.

With respect to section 4—

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman has passed the section to which I referred. I referred to section (c) of section 2 on page 17.

Mr. MAY. I am dealing with the report before me while the gentleman has the bill in mind.

Section 5 (a) provides certain designations of persons who are not subject to registration or to military service, and that consists of those in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; the various Reserve components; cadets in the United States Military Academy, including those who have been appointed and qualified to the academy as cadets; midshipmen in the United States Naval Academy; and cadets of advanced course, senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps are not to be registered. Provision is made in the case of diplomatic representatives and those who are not citizens of the United States, but serve in the diplomatic corps of other governments in this country.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEARSON. In connection with that section I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any provision made under this bill for exempting young men who are now reaching, we will say, the age of 20 or 21, who have served 1 or more years in an essentially military school and received military training which would be acceptable to the War Department?

Mr. MAY. That, I think, is covered in a subsequent section which deals with that subject in connection with students in the various schools and colleges, where they are in the schools in good faith, and they are deferred only. But that does not include 1-year training in the average military academy.

Mr. PEARSON. What I had in mind was not requiring the conscripting or the compulsory service of young men who have had training which would be equivalent to the 1 year's training provided for in this bill. I am satisfied the committee would not want to require an additional year's service of a man who had already had service, possibly, in excess of 1 year's training.

Mr. MAY. I think that is not provided in the bill and, in addition to that, it is provided where certain training has been had, which covers the very subject the gentleman mentions, they will not be required, but they may volunteer and they may remain in the Army if they want to.

Mr. PEARSON. Will the gentleman tell me in what section of the bill that appears?

Mr. MAY. I do not have it before me just at this time, but I shall be glad to call the gentleman's attention to it when I get to it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. For the benefit of the gentleman who just asked the question, I may call his attention to page 22, line 1, of the bill.

Mr. MAY. After dealing with these classes that are not subject to be inducted or registered, subsection (c) of section 5, relates to the question of ministerial students and ministers of the gospel, and may I say here and now that after long weeks of patient hearing, the House Military Affairs Committee heard every minister in this country who wanted to appear and we were honored with the appearance of such distinguished American preachers as Harry Emerson Fosdick, of New York, and Catholic bishops of the highest class and finest character. We heard the conscientious objectors and all of their representatives that we could possibly hear, and, summing it all up, their whole objection to the bill, aside from their objection to compulsory military training, was based upon the right of conscientious objection and in most instances to the right of the ministerial students to continue in their studies, and we have provided ample protection for those classes and those groups. So that the ministerial group of people have been satisfied with the provisions of the proposed law, so far as I know. I have heard no complaint since the bill was agreed upon and reported out.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. To clarify the question asked by the gentleman a moment ago regarding whether after a boy had had a year in a military school, I am wondering if the language on line 3, page 21, would be the language to which the chairman of the committee referred when he said he thought there was an exception provided, for covering that class of military-school students.

Mr. MAY. The provision on page 21, line 3, provides, as I have already stated, that cadets of the United States Military Academy, men who have been properly appointed and qualified, and so forth, which I referred to awhile ago, are not subject either to registration or to induction.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What I want to know is whether that word "cadet" refers only to the cadets of the United States Military Academy?

Mr. MAY. That includes all cadets, in both the Military and Naval Academies.

Mr. ALEXANDER. In military schools in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania?

Mr. MAY. Any place where they take a course of training equivalent to the United States Military Academy course?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; I assume if an amendment is offered to clarify that statement and make it positive, you would not object to such an amendment?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. That refers only to the cadets at the Military Academy itself. There is a later provision in line 10 as to the cadets in the advanced course of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, which applies to other schools than the Military Academy. But that applies only to those who are in the advanced course—in other words, the last 2 years.

Mr. MAY. In addition to that, in connection with that particular subject, there is a provision in the bill which provides that where students have entered universities and colleges that grant a degree in either the arts or sciences and make it a prerequisite to graduation, that they shall be deferred until July 1, 1941.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think what has been said is a little confusing. The gentleman does not mean to say to the House that anyone who has taken 1 year of military training in a military institute, Virginia Military Institute, for instance—

Mr. MAY. Or any other institute.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Or any other institute, will be exempt from this simply because he has had 1 year of training?

Mr. MAY. No. I did not state that. The word "cadets" used in the sentence referred to is followed by a comma, and then provides United States Military Academy. It simply means that in that sense, where that word "cadets" is used, it applies to the academy at West Point.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I hope you gentlemen will let me finish my statement.

Mr. ENGEL. Just a short question along that line. You have already passed section 3.

Mr. MAY. Very well, I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. Subsection (c), on page 17, reads as follows:

Each man, after completion of his training period, shall be transferred to a Reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States, and until the expiration of 10 years after such transfer, or until he reaches the age of 45, or until he is discharged, whichever occurs first, shall be deemed a member of such Reserve component, and be subject to such additional training as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law.

There are about 1,200,000 young men of each age group, like 21, 22, 23, and so forth. Suppose we draft 10 percent of that group, that 10 percent will be subject to call 10 years after discharge, and being placed in the Reserve Corps, while the other 90 percent would be exempt. Is that not true, under that section?

Mr. MAY. Under that provision, those who are trained under this legislation, at the expiration of their training period automatically go back home, but they become members of the reserve components of the Army, subject to call at any time within 10 years. If I am in error about that, I will be glad to be corrected.

Mr. ENGEL. Those young men would be subject to call for 2 weeks' training each year for a 10-year period, while the other 90 percent would not be. Is that right?

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. As I understand it, they would be subject to call only with their own consent.

Mr. ENGEL. It does not say anything about their own consent.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What will be the status of a young man 21 years of age who takes an examination either for West Point or Annapolis? Will he be exempt from the provisions of this law, or will he be obliged to go into training?

Mr. MAY. If he takes the examination and is admitted into the school, he becomes exempt.

Mr. DONDERO. And that is the meaning of the provision on page 21 of the bill?

Mr. MAY. Exactly.

Mr. DONDERO. Even though that would be the next year, he may come within the age limit of this bill?

Mr. MAY. That is right, but all those who are in school this year are deferred until July 1, 1941.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. The act provides that if they have been appointed and qualified.

Mr. DONDERO. But I am thinking of those who may come next year.

Mr. MAY. The induction will be largely over with next year.

May I say that testimony before our committee is conclusive of the fact that they are going to call them in increments of 400,000. The 1st of December—I suppose that

is what it will be now. The plan was to call them October 1; but now, due to delay in completing the legislation, it will be December 1; then 400,000 in the spring and then 600,000 at the end of the year, about next October. The Chief of Staff tells us that by calling them in such numbers at those times ample housing, clothing, and arms and other equipment will be available. Furthermore we are assured by Army officials that they will not be inducted into training until these things are available.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to ask the gentleman a question concerning the man who has had his year of training and becomes a part of the Reserve. Under the provisions of this section 3 (c), can he be called into active service by the President at any time without any action being taken by the Congress?

Mr. MAY. If he is a member of the Reserve component he is subject to call at all times, under the terms of his Reserve commission.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No matter whether Congress takes any action or not?

Mr. MAY. He is subject to call for this training, and the bill goes only to 1945. It terminates then by virtue of its own provisions unless in the meantime Congress does something else.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON] asked whether or not a graduate of a reputable military academy would be subjected to the draft. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not a graduate of a military academy, say the Virginia Military Academy, or some other academy that gives 4 years' military training and who is perhaps about 22 or 23 years of age, well within the limit, whether or not there is any provision to exempt such person from further military training?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. As I understand it, he would be deferred if he held a commission in the Reserves; otherwise not. In other words, if he held a commission in the Reserves, he would be subject to call under the provisions of his commission and would not therefore be inducted under this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. It might be well for such men to apply for commissions in the Reserves.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Normally they would hold commissions in the Reserves.

Mr. MAY. In this connection I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee that there is a provision in this bill by which a student who is 18 years of age may take his course of training by volunteering, and that exempts him from call later; then he can finish his education.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Is it contemplated under the provisions of this bill that every man who has 1 year of military training shall be entitled to a commission as an officer?

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. PEARSON. If this be true why would it be necessary for the graduate of a military academy or an accredited military school to be in the possession of a commission to be exempt from the provisions of this act?

Mr. MAY. Because as I understand the record before us and the contention of the War Department, there are certain standard schools like the academies that provide military training up to the standard that would be given these enrollees under the War Department; and they do not recognize all military schools.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Would the committee object to an amendment which would exempt, not from registration but from compulsory military service, all men within the ages specified in this bill who have had military training in an accredited military school satisfactory to the War Department?

Mr. MAY. I do not know what the committee would agree to, but I am not in position to speak for the committee on that question.

Mr. PEARSON. Unless some such provision as that is made, thousands and thousands of young men who have already had military training will be required to duplicate their training.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let me point out that while they may have had a certain amount of military training over their 3 years, it is in no sense of the word comparable to what they will receive as trainees under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. PEARSON. My suggestion was that the amendment be so worded as to include only those acceptable to the War Department.

Mr. ANDREWS. There are none except the two United States academies that are acceptable to the War Department, whose training in any way compares with the training they would get under this bill.

Mr. PEARSON. We might give the War Department an opportunity to pass on it.

Mr. ANDREWS. The War Department has already expressed itself.

Mr. MAY. The War Department now feels that the exemptions we have already made are all they will agree to, and we felt they were right about it.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman leaves that subject will he yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. I yield for a simple question.

Mr. GREEN. Is there any provision in the bill concerning the indebtedness of those who may be drafted?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is anticipating a section far over in the bill by which we provide that those who are called to serve over a period of a year shall be protected by the provisions of the Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Rights Act of 1918, and we go even further than that and insert a provision protecting them in the matter of rents for their homes, rents for their families, insurance premiums, and all those things. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that the House committee did everything it could to protect every class of these enrollees. If we overlooked anything it was unintentional.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman explain the provision in section 3, page 16, line 21, which reads—

*Provided, That voluntary enlistments in the land and naval forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, shall continue as now provided by law.*

What the terms are under which voluntary enlistment will be allowed, and, secondly, how that voluntary enlistment—

Mr. MAY. Let me answer one question at a time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And how that voluntary enlistment provision ties in with subsection (b) on page 17, which provides that not more than 1,000,000 men shall be inducted under the provisions of this act? The point of inquiry is this. I am wondering how you are going to provide for voluntary enlistments and at the same time provide for the conscription plan. Will the voluntary enlistments, as they come along, reduce the number of men to be taken into the Army by means of conscription? Is the million component going to be set up so that when it is reached no further voluntary enlistments will be accepted, or are you going to allow voluntary enlistments to continue thereafter and cut down the number of men who will be taken in under the conscription plan?

Mr. MAY. This legislation provides they may volunteer at any time, now or hereafter, and, furthermore, that every State shall be entitled to credit on their quotas for every man that they now have in any of the armed forces, either land or naval.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. How are those going to work together? Let us take an instance where you have a certain number of men under the conscription plan in a State; then

you have the voluntary arrangement, and under that arrangement young men within the ages of this bill volunteer. Are you going to turn those men back and say, "No; we already have your quota under the conscription plan," or are you going to allow them to come in under the volunteer plan and if they come in under the volunteer plan, will you not have a larger quota from that particular State than the plan calls for?

Mr. MAY. There is no purpose of the committee in any part of this legislation to restrict voluntary enlistment under the regular 3-year voluntary law, subject to medical examination at the time they come in. When those who are inducted along with the enrollees that are to be taken in or inducted under the provisions of this act reach at any one time the point of a million troops, including volunteers and those inducted under the provisions of this act, then both enlistments and volunteers under the act will cease until there is some reduction. That is until one of the groups taken in has finished their year's training and gone back to private life.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. You will cease voluntary enlistment and will no longer permit voluntary enlistment when you have reached a million quota, is that correct?

Mr. MAY. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. In my section during the World War we had the selective draft, and we had a great many volunteers for the Navy. When the selective draft came along you gave no credit at all for the volunteers. You took the full and complete share, and you took every boy we had in the selective draft, giving no credit for those who enlisted.

Mr. MAY. This bill gives credit for the volunteers in every place.

Mr. GIFFORD. I cannot see that in the bill. You set up civilian boards, but you have no definite method or instructions to them, as I read it, as to how they are going to pick 10 boys out of a hundred that may be available.

Mr. MAY. The bill provides that civilian boards shall be selected by appointment of the President on recommendation of the Governors of the various States. There are to be rules and regulations adopted in pursuance to this provision which provides that when they come in, if they claim exemption and the local board decides the exemption against them, they may appeal to an appeal board, hence to another board.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. The point I am making is this: You have an appeal board, plenty of them, but there are a hundred available men and you want five, you are going to gamble on the five by pulling them out of a hat?

Mr. MAY. Oh, yes. The system to be established will be just the same as it was during the World War.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is what the boys want to know. You are going to gamble with the five.

Mr. MAY. We are not going to gamble. We are making it impossible for anybody to be discriminated against. Strictly on a fair and impartial basis.

Mr. FADDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. The bill states that they shall be chosen in an impartial manner. That is up to each local board.

Mr. MAY. Yes; their own neighbors.

Mr. GIFFORD. If you were selected you would look at the other 95, would you not?

Mr. FADDIS. That may be true, but the bill states that they shall be chosen in an impartial manner, and that is left up to the board.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is all you can do. You are going to gamble with them.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I call the gentleman's attention to line 16, page 15, to this language:

The President is authorized to select for training and service in the manner herein provided, and to induct into the land and naval forces of the United States, such number of men as in his judgment, whether a state of war exists or not, is required in the national interest for such forces.

I want to be clear upon this. Under my construction of the bill, when the machinery is set up and registration has taken effect, the bill itself does not ipso facto induct into service a single person; they are only inducted into service and in such numbers as the President of the United States in his discretion requires and orders, the number not to exceed a million at any one time, is that correct?

Mr. MAY. That is correct, the maximum number at any one time being a million. I may say to the gentleman in that connection, for fear I shall overlook it at a later time, that we have changed the Senate provision on the minimum and maximum age of registration.

The Senate language provided for 21 to 31 years, and the House provision for 21 to 45 years. We did that upon the idea that the broader the base and the larger the number the easier it will be for the War Department and the local boards in classifying and selecting to select the number of men required, without discrimination, and to get the ideal man who is needed for the particular place.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In substance, this bill, if passed by the Congress, simply amounts to an authorization to the President to call into service and training those who are qualified to serve, as shown by the registration lists.

Mr. MAY. That is exactly it.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman at the very outset of his statement referred to this as a selective military training bill.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. LEAVY. However, in reading the bill, wherever the word "training" appears I notice that there always appears with it the word "service"—"training and service." I have checked hurriedly and find it appears 22 times in the bill. Consequently, the service feature of this bill stands on exactly a par with the training feature. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAY. That is right. The word "service" has reference to whatever service they may be called upon to perform while they are training. They are not held there for any period beyond 12 months at any one time.

Mr. LEAVY. But immediately when they have been selected for training they have become subject to service?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It may be mechanical service likewise, may it not?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. On this question of service and training, as a matter of fact, was not the word "service" put in there because there were members of the committee who felt that if we were just going to have a training bill we could train our soldiers best in continental United States, but that the purpose of this bill is "training and service," so that these so-called trainees may be taken to, let us say, South America or Nova Scotia to be given this "training"? Is that not the meaning back of the word "service"?

Mr. MAY. They will be trained wherever they are taken, under the provisions of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to take any more time, but I yield myself 5 additional minutes so that I may answer further questions.

Mr. MICHENER. This is at the risk of repetition, but for the sake of clarity: Someone inquired of the gentleman concerning subsection (c) on page 17. Let us say that a given number of men are drafted and taken into the service under this law. After they have served their period of 1 year, then

they are held to service for an additional period of 10 years. The question is, Supposing that 1 man out of every 10 registered is drafted, do I understand that that 1 man out of 10 is held to that service for a period of 10 years, and that the 9 men who are lucky enough not to be drafted are not required to go through any training or enter any service under this law until they become 45 years of age?

Mr. MAY. There is no provision in this bill requiring anybody to serve 10 years, except on this condition: When a man gets his year's training and goes back to civil life and is restored to his job, then if an emergency arises and his services are needed, he is subject to call as a member of the components of the armed services.

Mr. MICHENER. What happens to the nine other men who were registered but not drawn in the draft, under this proposed law?

Mr. MAY. They are just the unlucky fellows who missed an opportunity to get to serve their country, and the other fellow got the opportunity.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I want to get the quota provision straight. Do I correctly understand that not only a State but each county and probably each city is assigned a quota, and then credited against that State, that county, or that city, will be every person now in any branch of the service—Army, Navy, or Marine Corps—who claims that State, county, or city as his residence?

Mr. MAY. Every one of those who are in the service now, either from Georgia or Kentucky, let us say, is regarded as a part of the quotas. If Georgia is over its quota, the inductions will not be made from the State of Georgia but they will be taken from Kentucky, if it is under its quota.

Mr. PACE. But they will be credited not only to the State but down to the individual subdivisions such as the county and the city?

Mr. MAY. I am not sure about that. The language of the bill is to the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia.

Mr. PACE. If the Chairman will permit, I might call his attention to the language, "and for subdivisions thereof."

Mr. MAY. Yes; that would include it.

Mr. PACE. And credit shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions. Do I understand this would mean residents of a county or a city?

Mr. MAY. A county or a municipality.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Am I correct in assuming that a young man who has arrived at the age of 18 years can anticipate his service and become voluntarily inducted? For instance, suppose he should graduate from high school next June, and he is 18 years old. Instead of waiting until he is 21 to go through with his college work, he would finish out his year's military training, and then enter his college course.

Mr. MAY. He would then enter his college course; that is right.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In section 3 on page 15, I notice that every male citizen between the ages of 21 and 45 is subject to the provisions of this draft and millions of aliens are excluded, including many million refugees like the Rothschilds, who have recently arrived. Does the gentleman believe that is fair?

Mr. MAY. We provide for a certain class of aliens here, and that is the class of aliens who have already declared their intention to become—

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What about the many alien refugees who are coming here now and hollering "Stop Hitler"? Why not include them in the draft so that they can prepare to help stop him?

Mr. MAY. Just a moment. I do not yield further to the gentleman if he will not allow me to answer.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. This bill confines the actual service of the man selected to 1 year?

Mr. MAY. That is right. Under the provisions of this bill, the service is limited to 12 months.

Mr. MOTT. And if during the period of 10 years when he is in reserve the Army should require him, that would call for further legislation?

Mr. MAY. No; he would be subject to call.

Mr. MOTT. That is not the way I understood the language of the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I said, "subject to the future action of the Congress," but if he has been drawn, he can be used at any time within 10 years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, throughout the entire argument on this historic conscription measure I have been unable to dismiss from my mind the question propounded by the disciple Matthew, "What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

Again and again during the progress of the debates on this measure this question, as paraphrased in relation to the pending question, recurs, "What is the United States profited to achieve world power and dominion if in the achievement we destroy our own liberties and acquire a totalitarian despotism in place of our democracy?" [Applause.]

Realizing the tremendous consequences of the vote to be cast on this legislation, and with full realization of the effect it will have upon our system of government, I have given long and serious consideration to the question in the hope that the vote I shall cast will be in the interest of preserving our traditions, our ideals, and our democratic institutions of government.

I am convinced that the pending measure threatens to plunge us headlong into a dictatorial militarism that is wholly incompatible with the rights, privileges, and liberties enjoyed by a free people.

The bill in its present form proposes to register, for possible conscription into the military service of the Nation for at least 1 year, the entire male population of the Nation between the ages of 21 and 45 years. Heralded at its inception as a proposal for universal military training, it proves to be nothing of the kind. Under its terms it leaves to the discretion of the War Department and the President the making of rules and regulations for deferment of service. This vast power thus granted to the military permits control over the lives and destiny of the entire registry. This control may be exercised through the allocation of men to particular industries as a condition of continued deferment and compels millions of others, regardless of will, to be subjected to the threat of conscription at any time during the entire period the law is in force. Thus it is apparent that the military forces of the Nation assume complete control over the lives and destiny, not only of those selected in the draft but, through the power to cancel or change deferment, over the lives of the entire registry. Does this great grant of power smack of dictatorship? Remember, my colleagues, we are at peace. Never before in the history of our Nation has such a proposal been suggested in time of peace. The Declaration of Independence itself cries out against the whole philosophy of this bill. The signers of that historic document addressed their complaints not only to a despotic sovereign but to the world, and in clarion terms said:

He has kept among us in times of peace standing armies without the consent of our legislatures. He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power.

The Constitution itself clearly reflects the struggle of a free people for the maintenance of human liberty, and in its enactment its framers sought to destroy for all time the very conception of government this bill would now revive as a vital part of our machinery of government.

No one can read the constitutional debates without achieving a conviction that the framers of that great document had constantly in mind the age-old struggle of man against oppression and dictatorship and a determination that there

should be no grant of power from the States to the Federal Government that would permit, in times of peace, the resurrection of the very tyrannies over the people that they so bitterly complained of in the Declaration of Independence. This Government was set up by a people smarting under the oppression of military tyranny. They determined to be a free people—free to worship, free to speak, free to work, free to play, free from the unbearable yoke of an all-powerful centralized despotism. For over a century and a half our people, led and inspired by this unquenchable passion for liberty, have achieved unparalleled progress and opportunity.

It is claimed by some that today world and domestic conditions have changed to such an extent that we must forget the Declaration of Independence, lay aside the Constitution and the advice and intentions of its framers. They contend that we must relegate these instruments with their guarantees of personal liberty and individual freedom into the realm of the historic past and because other countries have given up the fight and have abandoned the tenets of democracy in their mad struggle for world power, that we likewise should ape their doctrines, else we too become a victim of military aggression. My colleagues, let us pause and ponder seriously this grave question.

The American conception of the state has always been that it is an agency created by the people for the promotion and protection of the individual welfare of its people. The state is a creature of the people, and its entire existence is for the people. The entire philosophy of our form of government denies the doctrine that the people are subservient to the state. The state has no interests separate or distinct from those of its citizens. The promotion of individual liberty and freedom of action is the very foundation and groundwork of the state. Any infringement of those rights under our system of government has always been most jealously resisted in the absence of a clear and unmistakable showing of necessity.

The totalitarian philosophy which we now seek to emulate is the very opposite. Such a state is recognized by its subjects to have interests separate and distinct from those of the people. These interests are recognized to be superior to those of the individual. Thus, the maintenance of vast armies, secret police, despotic decrees, orders, and regimentation are justified by the dictators. It makes no difference how much the individual may suffer, as he owes a strict obedience to every caprice or whim of the dictator. The totalitarian state is supreme and its people mere pawns to be shifted about, regardless of individual rights, as a supreme council, directed by a dictator, may order. Opportunism and expediency are the guiding influences in the totalitarian philosophy, and the state permits no resistance either of thought or of action.

Why, you would almost think, my colleagues, that we here in this body today are being dominated completely by that philosophy. I say this after listening to the speech of the gentleman who is running for Vice President on the Democratic ticket, when he said in no uncertain terms that any individual citizen of this Nation, or any Member of this Congress who dares to speak out and oppose this program, must be in sympathy with Hitler and must be preaching the doctrine of Hitlerism.

I ask you, my colleagues, is it not futile, therefore, to compare our conception of government with that of the totalitarian states? Shall we as a people submit to the argument that in order to successfully fight alien philosophies we should adopt those philosophies as our own? To me, despite all the allegations and contentions as to the critical character of our world position and the necessity for defending our democracy, I cannot lend support to a program that step by step is inevitably leading us to war and building up in our own country a despotism fashioned in the same mold as that which we now claim the ambition to destroy. Again I ask you in all candor and seriousness, What is the United States profited to achieve world power and dominion if in the achievement we destroy our own liberties and our own democracy?

The pending measure has been publicized from one end of the country to the other as providing for a system of uni-

versal military training. This propaganda is being fed to the American people to sugar-coat and cover up the real purpose that underlies it. The proponents have thus painted the picture in order to attempt to allay the fears and suspicions of the American people and to hide the real sinister purpose of this legislation. They know that under present conditions our people are willing to accept the philosophy of universal military training as part of our defense program. But, although they must know that this bill does not so provide, they still permit an uninformed public to so think. Even a superficial examination discloses that the pending legislation does not provide for a system of universal military training. Any such program would of necessity have to start in the schools, followed by training for stated periods of all our people. Under this bill no such program is contemplated. Only those between the ages of 21 and 45 are to be registered. Out of this group only those who cannot secure deferred classification are subject to the draft. Out of those subject to conscription not more than 1,000,000 are to be in training at any one time. Thus it is apparent that young men in schools and colleges up to 21 are not included in the program, nor are the millions of others between 21 and 45 who may be granted deferred classification under the regulations to be imposed by the President and the War Department. To designate such a program as one calling for universal military training is to indict the intelligence of the American people.

I know full well that the distinguished gentleman from New York, one of the coauthors of this bill, is honest, able, and sincere, and that at no time has he ever tried to ascribe to this legislation any purpose other than that which is specifically to be found in its terms. However, without any intent to cast aspersions upon my distinguished colleague, I think it can safely be said that as a result of years of training and experience he is and has been an avowed militarist and that he looks at this problem entirely from the standpoint of the Army. I would direct your attention to the fact, however, that this legislation opens the door for the promulgation of many rules, regulations, and policies which may vitally affect the welfare of all the people of this country. Neither the gentleman from New York nor the distinguished Senator from Nebraska will write those rules and regulations. Neither one of these able and distinguished gentlemen will direct the policies to be invoked under this bill. Those rules, regulations, and policies will be invoked and determined by the President and high-ranking officials in the War Department. I therefore conceive that it is entirely proper to interpret the real purpose behind this legislation by examining the moves and motives of those who will invoke and enforce it.

Just a short time ago the President and his spokesmen were talking to the American people of the necessity for "national defense," and the press, magazines, radio, and motion pictures began to grind out propaganda depicting the curse of Hitlerism and the imminence of an attack against our Nation from that source. Nothing definite was presented, to be sure, but enough to arouse the feelings and passions of our people. Louder and louder became the chant, until like the booming voice of the sewage inspector in the basement of the coliseum at Chicago crying over the loud speakers, "We want Roosevelt," we find ourselves today literally awed by the work of the high-pressure salesmen who chant incessantly "Prepare! Prepare! Spend! Spend! Beware! Beware, lest we, too, perish." As the chorus of the warmongers increases its tempo we no longer hear of national defense, but there has gradually been substituted the cry and demand for "hemispheric defense." No longer do we hear demands for 10,000 bomber planes. Fifty thousand is the tempo now. No longer merely 1,000,000 men. Four million men in the Army is the cry. Truly the god of war is in the saddle today and is driving his spurs deeper and deeper into the consciousness of our people with a ruthlessness that compels some timid souls in and out of Congress to be whipped into line so as to swallow the whole campaign and program hook, line, and sinker.

We are told that the United States is in a most critical position today, and the fears of our people have been played upon to such an extent that there are those who already hear

the drone of airplane motors and the bursting of bombs from some attacking enemy. Let us get our feet on the ground for a moment and call back a few historic facts that are within the recent memory of all of us.

Japan plunged her immense war machine into China and plundered and killed millions of defenseless people, and during it all the administration was unafraid. So callous have we been as a people that for several years we have furnished both sides in that hideous war with implements used to prolong it and to carry on its program of aggression and ruthless destruction of life and property. Did such action on the part of Japan inspire a serious or sustained fear as to the imminence of attack from that source?

Russia, inspired by the cruel regime of Stalin, attacked poor little Finland. Were we placed in such fear that we asked for conscription then? Russia marched its soldier hordes into bleeding Poland and enslaved half of that nation. Did we manifest fear or ask for conscription then? She took a large part of Rumania, all of Latvia and Estonia in one gulp—sovereign people and nations wiped out and destroyed overnight. Did we ask for conscription then? Italy swallowed up Ethiopia and Albania by force of military might. Were we shaken with fear and did we demand conscription then? Germany crushed the peaceful, God-fearing people of Norway, Holland, Denmark, and Belgium and overran them all with military force. Did we clamor for conscription then? France, our friend through the years of the life of our Republic, fell mortally wounded, victim of her own incompetence and the irresistible mechanized forces of Hitler. Then and only then did the clamor for preparedness and conscription begin to be heard. With the attack on England, however, and the threatened dissolution of the British Empire, the pent-up forces of war and conscription broke loose upon our people with devastating fury. Hundreds of trained speakers, publicity men, and advertising agencies went feverishly to work and for months have been spending millions of dollars in the United States for propaganda designed to instill the doctrine of fear and hate into the minds of the American people so as to prepare them for entrance into this war. These propagandists have pointed to the very evident philosophy of Hitler to achieve world dominion, but for some reason that you may discern for yourselves, nothing has been said as to the world program of the Communist Russia that for over 20 years has been working diligently in the promotion of world revolution with the ultimate object and aim of destroying our Nation by force and violence. With all of the ruthless, bloody history of Russia in plain view and with abundant evidence of sovereign people pillaged and enslaved, there was no call for conscription and no apparent fear on the part of those who clamor for it today. On the contrary, this administration not only recognized such a government but sent messages of congratulation and entered into the most friendly trade relations with her.

Why the difference in national attitude? Hitler in his utterances has indicated an ultimate desire for world dominion. So has Stalin. Why direct all of our energies in preparing against one and at the same time so affectionately treat the other? In my humble judgment, both are a blight upon the liberty and the future of free people throughout the world. Time will not permit a further discussion of the background of this present agitation and propaganda, and I leave it to you in the coolness and sanctity of your own conscience to make your own answer.

It is said that we are now faced with a dire emergency that justifies the abandonment of all our democratic traditions and the substitution in its place of a program of conscription dictated by governmental decree. I refuse to be a party to any program that so definitely threatens to involve this Nation in war and which by its fundamental terms disregards the very foundations upon which our Republic was built. Let us have the emergency more clearly defined. Does the threat to our security emanate from Hitler or from Stalin or from both? Does it emanate from Japan or from Italy or from both? Is the threat to our democracy involved in some combination of threats emanating from all four totalitarian governments? Whom are we to fight and where?

Against whom is our defense directed? I believe that the American people are entitled to have this policy more clearly defined.

Mr. Wallace, apparently speaking for and with the full approbation of the administration, defined Hitler as the sole menace. He very magnanimously refrained from even mentioning the menace of communism or fascism as exemplified by Russia, Italy, and Japan. If his statement is to be accepted as defining our national attitude, then I think it can safely be said that the administration is determined to somehow, somewhere, fight Hitler. If so, are not the American people entitled to know the truth? Why, then, all this hypocrisy about neutrality? Why drag us into this war step by step, utterance by utterance, when neither the Congress nor the people have had a chance by vote to express themselves? If we are already in this war on the side of England, why not honestly say so? If the administration intends to fight Hitler, why not say so? Why not come out into the open and give Congress and the American people the facts?

It is true that, under the Constitution, Congress alone has the right and the power to declare war. However, war-mongering speakers and leaders by words and deeds may commit acts of war that may cause a declaration of war to come from the other side. Then it is too late for us to withdraw, and, as a result, a nation committed to the cause of peace may be drawn into war against its will. If, as is contended by so many, the future of our Nation and the world is wholly dependent upon Great Britain, why are we delaying under the specious plea of rendering all aid to Great Britain "short of war"? Such an attitude makes us a nation of profit-taking hypocrites. I have much more respect for the man who sincerely believes that our destiny is inevitably linked with that of England and that we should actively and openly go to her assistance than I have for the man who slyly and deceitfully will involve us in this war step by step under the guise of rendering "all aid to England short of war."

I am opposed to the whole business and believe that we are again being led to the slaughter as blind victims of a vicious propaganda machine. I believe that our destiny as a nation is centered in the advice of Washington and that by remaining at peace, conserving our manpower and resources, and by protecting our neutrality, we may grow strong enough so that when the nations of Europe have exhausted themselves in the present struggle we may play an important part in seeing that justice is done in the post-war agreements.

During the debates on the neutrality bill and from time to time since, man after man has stood in the Well of this House and declared in no uncertain terms that he "would never vote to cause a mother's son to shed his blood on foreign soil." I ask these same gentlemen today when they vote for this bill whether they are keeping faith with that promise. Oh, yes; they will wiggle and squirm and say that they meant European soil. I ask you, however, whether the fever-ridden swamps of Venezuela, Uruguay, or Bolivia are any less foreign to an American boy than the fields of France. Personally, I cannot see the difference. Are these National Guard men and draftees to be sent to South America and Central America? The President says the chances are 100 to 1 against it. If this is true, then why this great draft army? Personally I have heard promises from the President before which were recklessly and heedlessly destroyed and forgotten almost as soon as made. I am not willing in the face of all the accumulated evidence to the contrary to take even the one chance he referred to. I am convinced that plans are already made to garrison troops in strategic positions all through South and Central America as well as in the West Indies, and that the necessities of hemispheric defense as projected by this administration will call for hundreds of thousands of our boys to be scattered all over the Western Hemisphere. Does this program sound like 1 year's military training?

Why not tell the people the truth? This legislation has in it the very language that will keep these drafted boys in the Army indefinitely. I am convinced that this is the secret plan. If it is not the plan, then why the language in the bill requiring a draftee to remain in the service for an indefinite period if Congress declares the national interest to be imperiled? Is

the national interest already imperiled? Certainly the proponents of this measure have depicted it in bold relief. The President in his May 16 address frightened the American people by cleverly depicting the peril.

Is not the national interest imperiled when the whole National Guard is called to the colors, when we are spending \$15,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for national defense and now propose to conscript the men as well as the industries of the Nation in times of peace? In God's name, what else should prompt sane men to make such proposals?

If the national interest is imperiled, why not be honest with the American people and say so by legislative declaration and let the mothers and fathers of this Nation know that these draftees are not to come home after a year's service, but that when they are called they are to remain in the Army as long as the emergency exists? Why lead them into this mess by withholding information they honestly should have? I know that the American people can be trusted to be placed in possession of the truth and the facts and that they will respond in any sacrifice when they realize the truth. I say to you, however, that they will live to hate those who drag them away from their families and jobs through fraud and misrepresentation. The people of the United States who must suffer and sacrifice and die are entitled to know the truth and the facts. That is democracy. The other is tyranny and despotism.

Why not tell the people the truth about the Overton amendment? Why lead an unsuspecting people to gather from headlines that you propose to conscript wealth as well as men, when in fact you know that this amendment does nothing of the kind? I quote the amendment:

*Provided, That whenever the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy determines that any existing manufacturing plant or facility is necessary for the national defense and is unable to arrive at an agreement with the owner of such plant or facility for its use or operation by the War Department or the Navy Department, as the case may be, the Secretary, under the direction of the President, is authorized to institute condemnation proceedings with respect to such plant or facility and to acquire it under the provisions of the act of February 26, 1931, except that, upon the filing of a declaration of taking in accordance with the provisions of such act, the Secretary may take immediate possession of such plant and facility and operate it either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms.*

Here is another evidence of the way the warmongers are misleading the people of this Nation. This amendment does not in any sense conscript wealth, but does allow the Government to take over any existing manufacturing plant or other facility by condemnation proceedings. It will be noted that the owners of the property thus condemned are to be paid in full in cash before the Government takes possession, and if the owners are not satisfied with the amount set by the Government they have the right to contest for a larger amount in the court. The owner of the plant or facility thus condemned is assured that his money will be returned dollar for dollar, and the Government under such a program will have on its hands manufacturing plants and facilities of all kinds to operate or dispose of when the emergency has passed. In the meantime, under such a program, if the Government operates the plants or facilities, the employees become Government workers. I ask you in all fairness whether or not this does not open the door to conscription of labor. Does not such a plan, if placed in the law, make it possible for a dictatorial-minded administration to not only conscript men for military service but to conscript labor in factories and businesses and to place almost every business in the Nation, if the Government so desired, under Government ownership? Instead of designating such a proposal as one to conscript wealth, it should be termed a proposal to save wealth and to conscript labor. I am opposed to the whole program, because it is clear to me that in our hysterical efforts to fight totalitarian philosophies now rampant throughout the world we are proposing to substitute in the place of our traditional liberties the very philosophies of government we claim we are seeking to destroy.

I have voted for every proposal submitted by the War and Navy Departments, including the authority to mobilize the National Guard, in the interests of developing in this Nation a sound and adequate national defense. I do not intend, how-

ever, from now on to be driven by hysterical appeals of passion and hate to vote for additional proposals that I believe will ultimately impose a military dictatorship upon us.

What constitutes an adequate national defense? For answer to this question I can state generally that it involves something more than the mere training of an army, the building of airplanes, tanks, machine guns, motorized equipment, and artillery. It involves the development of an intense spirit of national patriotism in the hearts and the souls of the American people and the destruction of the subversive influences that have been allowed to run rampant within our midst. The experts to whom I must refer for information as to the necessities of national defense along naval, aeronautical, and military lines are not in agreement. Many state that no definite program has yet been evolved. There appears to be agreement, however, that the first line of the defense of the United States is the Navy and Coast Guard, supplemented by an adequate air force. Many military experts have stated repeatedly that a thoroughly mechanized, well-trained, mobile army of 400,000 to 500,000 men could defend this Nation against attack from any aggressor when supported by an adequate naval and aviation defense. The records indicate to me that the Air Corps, the Navy, and the Coast Guard, in spite of the long term of enlistment and in spite of the high standards imposed upon enlistees, are enabled to get all of the men necessary at this time by voluntary enlistment.

The principal question of conscription revolves around the Army. If the military experts who claim that a mobile army of 400,000 to 500,000 men, acting in collaboration with the Navy and the air force, can successfully defend this Nation from any aggressor are right, then by the passage of the National Guard bill, incorporating them into the Regular Army, we have provided the manpower for such a defense force. There remains the necessity of equipping them with the instruments necessary in modern warfare. Why, then, are we speaking of an army of a million and a half or 2,000,000 men? It should be obvious that what I have heretofore stated must be true—that the secret plans call for hemispheric defense, which will involve ultimately several million men; and if so, the people of this Nation should be so advised.

It is claimed that sufficient men cannot be obtained as rapidly as necessary for the Army. Why not? Certainly the records show that we do not as yet have the facilities to take care of the National Guard, to say nothing of arming, equipping, and housing 900,000 draftees. I am convinced that if the Army were popularized and provided with decent pay and opportunities for vocational training and education, such as are to be found in the Navy, marines, Coast Guard, and Air Corps, sufficient men can be secured through voluntary enlistment. If it is proposed to immediately ship hundreds of thousands of men into Central America and South America, perhaps the voluntary-enlistment plan will not furnish them as fast as the Army desires, but I think the records indicate that voluntary enlistments are producing enough men to man every gun, every plane, and every tank as far as the industry of this Nation can turn them out.

The voluntary-enlistment plan in peacetime is the democratic method. Let us continue it. If we are no longer at peace, let us say so. If we are going to war, or if war is imminent, or if the national security is threatened, let us be courageous enough to bring a resolution before the Congress and permit a vote upon it. Whenever the Congress by a solemn vote declares that the Nation is imperiled, or that we are involved in a state of war, and the American people are so advised, then and only then, in my humble judgment, is it time to talk or consider the subject of conscription. I cannot in good conscience adopt such a policy in time of peace.

France has had conscription for years, and with the alleged greatest army in the world, and with manpower galore, she today lies dismembered and in ruins. Poland had conscription, as well as nation after nation of the Old World. They have had it for centuries. Our forefathers came here to get away from it. Recent history discloses that mere manpower today is not enough. We must have machines. We must have spirit. We must have unity and a people in sympathy with the program and enlightened as to its purpose.

Without that intense spirit of nationalism reflected in patriotic fervor and unity, history discloses that the mere accumulation of great bodies of men into armies will not alone and of itself create an adequate national defense. This Government must state its purpose clearly to our people and define its program. We must hold onto the democratic processes and defend democracy in the world by protecting our own and making it strong. To embark upon this program while our Nation is at peace threatens to destroy the very liberties we enjoy and substitute in its place the alien, totalitarian philosophies we claim to despise.

Permit me to again ask you the question, What is the United States profited to achieve world power if in the achievement we destroy our own liberties and acquire a totalitarian despotism at home? [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill in its entirety; I am thoroughly in accord with it, but in addressing the House at this time I desire to call your attention to what has been referred to as the Russell-Overton amendment.

I desire to address the House on the subject of the slowing down of national-defense preparations and of a substitute amendment for the commandeering amendment to the conscription bill, the so-called Russell amendment.

In the period before and during the last World War, 1914-17, the huge allied purchasing orders raised the general price levels of the United States, and these orders preempted the munitions market to such an extent that four times during the period 1914-17 it was necessary to enact and reenact laws designed—

(a) To give the United States Army and Navy authority to make industrial plants take their orders.

(b) To give these orders priority where needed over Allied orders or other orders for private account.

(c) To impose a penalty to make (a) and (b) effective in case of refusal to take orders, the penalty to take the form of commandeering authority or a fine and prison sentence for violations.

History repeats itself, and today again demand is about to run ahead of supply in the munitions markets of the United States. This is due to two major factors: First, to the existence of large British orders with large profits in sight; and, second, to the urgent national-defense orders of the United States for ships, aircraft, and other munitions resulting from the billions which have been appropriated in this Congress for expediting national defense.

We may expect, therefore, two things: First, a rise in the general price level when demand exceeds supply, and second, a desire of the manufacturers, particularly the small ones, to take British orders or commercial orders with large profits, and not United States Government orders, particularly if the Government orders have excess-profit limitations.

I appreciate, of course, that the proposed tax bill places all these orders on the same basis as to excess profits, and the United States Government orders would, therefore, have as much value as other orders in a theoretical sense, but something more is necessary than this if national defense is not to bog down, and it is the responsibility of Congress to concern itself with this matter and determine what should be done. There is nothing abnormal about the desire of a manufacturer to make a profit, but it is the business of Congress to see that these profits are not excessive, and that Government orders receive priority, if such priority is desired in the interest of national defense. It is for the purpose of proposing a medium of assuring that national-defense preparations do not bog down, that I am addressing the House, and I have an amendment drafted along the lines of the final legislation that was in effect at the end of the World War. It gives both the manufacturer and the United States what is their proper due, protecting the rights and interests of both.

As you know, Congress has already, in this session, enacted legislation bearing on the subject. Public, No. 671, Seventy-

sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, the so-called naval speed-up bill, contained a commandeering proviso, as follows:

*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is further authorized, under the general direction of the President, whenever he deems any existing manufacturing plant or facility necessary for the national defense, and whenever he is unable to arrive at an agreement with the owner of any such plant or facility for its use or operation, to take over and operate such plant or facility either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to fix the compensation to the owner of such plant or facility: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Congress, every 3 months, the contracts entered into under the provisions of this subsection.

After the passage of this act, and after consideration of the broad effect of this provision, which in effect enabled the Secretary of the Navy to take over a plant the method of operation of which he was in disagreement with, although the owner may not have violated any law or agreement, I personally, when the second supplemental national defense appropriation bill, H. R. 10263, was on the floor of the House, introduced an amendment repealing this proviso. The amendment was voted into the bill by the House. When this second supplemental national defense appropriation bill later was before the Senate Deficiency Subcommittee, that committee developed that certain difficulties were being had in placing munitions orders, particularly due to the refusal of subcontractors, who already had all the orders they wanted, to enter into further subcontracts which had Vinson-Trammell excess-profits limitations. As a result two amendments were placed on the table in the Senate and were later incorporated in the conscription bill, S. 4164, on the floor of the Senate. One of these is an extension of the Vinson-Trammell excess-profits limitations to both Army and Navy ordnance. The second, the so-called Russell amendment, is another commandeering amendment, which reads as follows:

SEC. 11. The first and second provisos in section 8 (b) of the act approved June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That whenever the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy determines that any existing manufacturing plant or facility is necessary for the national defense and is unable to arrive at an agreement with the owner of such plant or facility for its use or operation by the War Department or the Navy Department, as the case may be, the Secretary, under the direction of the President, is authorized to institute condemnation proceedings with respect to such plant or facility and to acquire it under the provisions of the act of February 26, 1931 (48 Stat. 1421), except that, upon the filing of a declaration of taking in accordance with the provisions of such act, the Secretary may take immediate possession of such plant or facility and operate it either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms pending the determination of the issues: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to render inapplicable existing State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, and employment standards of the employees in such plant or facility."

The Russell amendment, you will note, is an amendment of two provisos in section 8 (b) of Public, No. 671, which the House had already repealed in taking action on my amendment to the second supplemental national-defense appropriation bill. So it was necessary, therefore, in order to give the Russell amendment effect, for the Senate Deficiency Committee to repeal the amendment which the House had placed in H. R. 10263 at my suggestion.

While I am in entire sympathy with the purposes of the Russell amendment, and while I am no appeaser for special business interests, and see no reason why business should expect to milk the Government when it is in a hurry to attain adequate national defense, I think the Russell amendment is too drastic in its powers and language and too limited in its scope to properly achieve the end it is designed to reach. The Russell amendment, you will note, permits the Secretaries of War and Navy to take a plant without the manufacturer having failed to take or carry out munition orders. The Russell amendment says the plant may be taken if the Secretaries of War and Navy fail to reach an agreement for its use and operation. Therefore, the amendment does not adequately protect the rights of the manufacturer in its private property. The Russell amendment is along the lines of the clause in Public, No. 671, which the House has already repealed in acting on my amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think that the vicious portion of the Russell amendment, if there is a vicious portion, is the part that would leave in the hands of the Government, after the emergency was over, a large number of manufacturing plants that might have been taken over by the Government, whereas the modified form of the amendment puts it on a rental basis and leaves the ownership in the present owners?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Kentucky is absolutely right and I certainly hope the House will not adopt the Russell amendment in its present language. Something along that line can be worked out and I am inserting in the RECORD an amendment which I am going to ask permission to read, which I think covers the situation and accomplishes everything that everyone wants to accomplish and that should be accomplished.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wonder if my colleague would also insert in the RECORD, in his remarks at this point, section 80 of the National Defense Act, which empowers the Government to do practically all of the things that are provided for in the Russell amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I understand the committee has practically adopted the language of the Defense Act of 1917 and is going to offer that as an amendment to the bill. If the parliamentary situation develops, I propose to offer an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment to the Russell amendment.

I have had an opportunity to give the subject further consideration and I am proposing an amendment, limited in time to the emergency we are now in.

The amendment I propose is limited strictly to the emergency declared by the President on the 8th day of September.

Limited in time to the emergency we are now in and broad enough in its scope to insure that national defense will not bog down and adequate to cover us if we get into a war.

It protects the interests of the Government and it protects the manufacturers, insofar as possible in an emergency, in the rights to their property, and takes possession of a plant, or part of it, only when such manufacturer acts in a manner derogatory to the interests of the United States or is unwilling to take national-defense orders, and even then it secures his rights and compensates for the use or loss of his property.

There is nothing radical about the amendment I propose. It incorporates the features found necessary in the period 1916-18. I would like to see this amendment placed in H. R. 10263 by the House conferees in lieu of the House amendment that was stricken out by the Senate, and I would like to see it substituted for the Russell amendment in the conscription bill. It could then be taken out of whichever bill passes first.

In passing the excess-profits tax bill you have fixed up the amortization of capital facilities for the munitions manufacturers. You also have prevented any war millionaires being made by munitions orders, and you in this law also placed British, United States Government, and private orders on the same footing as to profits, so the manufacturer, therefore, should not have any preference as to which one he desires. The amendment I propose will complete the job and insure that national-defense orders can be placed, that they will have priority, and that national defense, therefore, cannot bog down due to any failure of Congress to have provided administrative authority.

It will also look out for certain conditions which occurred in the World War period where a manufacturer might be inefficient or indifferent to the requirements of national defense, or where there might be "fifth column" activities, either in the management or in the employees, or even sabotage in the factory, or where defective deliveries of material might occur. It is necessary that we protect the Government and that we do not permit the eagerness of manufacturers to make profits prevent us from insuring that the interests

of the Government are protected. The amendment is as follows, and I invite your attention to it, because I want the House to consider this in connection with the amendment that will be offered by the Military Affairs Committee:

That during the present emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, whenever the Secretaries of War and Navy, respectively, have tried and failed either—

(a) To place or negotiate contracts, in accordance with existing law, for authorized objects, or parts thereof, for their departments, with any individual, trustee, firm, association, company, or corporation, hereinafter referred to in this bill as "the contractor or subcontractor," or

(b) To place or negotiate such contracts at reasonable rates of delivery or at prices they consider to be fair and reasonable, they are authorized and empowered in their discretion, after consultation with the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, within the limits of the sums appropriated to their departments therefor, to place orders with such contractors or subcontractors for such authorized objects, or parts thereof, as the interests of their departments may require, which are of the nature, kind, or quantity usually produced, or capable of being produced by such contractors or subcontractors.

Compliance with all such orders shall be obligatory on any contractor or subcontractor to whom they are given and they shall, in the discretion of the Secretary placing them, take precedence over all orders or contracts placed with such contractor or subcontractor. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall, in all such cases, where it is in the interests of the United States, pool their orders or coordinate their orders, prices, and priorities.

When an order has been placed as indicated above with any contractor or subcontractor owning, leasing, or operating any plant or factory equipped or suitable for the building or production of such authorized objects, or parts thereof, and such contractor or subcontractor shall refuse to accept such order, or, if he accepts the order and thereafter, in the opinion of the Secretary placing the order, fails to carry it out satisfactorily, the Secretary shall advise the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense of such failure to place the order or unsatisfactory performance, and if the Advisory Commission is unable to induce the contractor or subcontractor to take the order or to give satisfactory performance, such Commission shall so advise the President, who may, in his discretion, on recommendation of the Secretary placing the order (if such Secretary is unable to effect satisfactory leasing arrangements with such contractor or subcontractor, which he is hereby authorized to make), take immediate possession of such plant or factory, or necessary part thereof, and operate it either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms during the period its use is necessary. The President is authorized to fix and require adequate compensation to be paid by the interested Secretary from any funds available to his Department for such use during the period the plant or factory, or necessary part thereof, is in the possession of the United States, and when its use is no longer required, the President shall return it in good condition to such contractor or subcontractor or owner. The President shall in each case, before he takes possession as indicated above, report to Congress failure to accept an order or give satisfactory performance. If Congress is not in session, such report shall be filed with the Clerks of the House and Senate.

I propose to offer that as a substitute for the amendment that will be submitted by the Military Affairs Committee, and I respectfully invite the attention of the entire membership to this amendment and let us see if we cannot work out something that will be adequate and fair to the manufacturer and at the same time fair to the Government, so that the national-defense program will not bog down.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to the proposed amendment, I observe that it is limited to the emergency declared by the President.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Whereas the amendment proposed by the Military Affairs Committee is coextensive with this bill, why provide for the drafting of men until 1945 and only limit the drafting of plants for the emergency?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The emergency may pass away before 1945.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then we ought not to draft men.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is in error there. If we today embark upon a definite national program of training the youth year in and year out, we would contribute a substantial benefit to the country. In later years, probably that may come about.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman intend to request that the language in the appropriation bill repealing the section of the act of June 28 be carried out?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The parliamentary situation is this: The Senate struck out the amendment that we put in. The Russell amendment is an amendment to that. Therefore, if the House conferees struck out the amendment that we put in, which will repeal section 8 (b), then the Russell amendment would be hanging in the air without anything to amend. The law to which the Russell amendment was applicable would have been repealed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My second question with respect to the proposed amendment is, Why disregard the language in the act of 1916 as amended by the act of 1920, which is being followed by the Military Affairs Committee and which has been before the courts, for new language which is untried?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think this language is an improvement on the language written 20 years ago, because this is clothed around the National Council of Defense, and it has the same objective and the purpose is along the same line, but I think this amendment is in better language than the act of 1916.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman give us some constructive criticism of the act of 1920 before he asks us to adopt new language?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If my amendment does not appeal to the gentleman he has the right to vote against it.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Does the gentleman's proposed amendment contain any penalties for its violation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all, except the Government takes it over and operates it. One of the weaknesses of the amendment of 1917 is that it does not deal with the slowing down and the failure to produce the material necessary, and this even writes into the law protection against "fifth columnists" and any sabotage that might occur.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Does the gentleman realize that the House committee amendment provides serious penalties for its violation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes. That is in the act of 1916.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I want to ask my colleague if his amendment would take care of a situation such as arose in the case of the Ford Motor Co.? Your amendment, as I understand relates only to contracts for the purchase of supplies or equipment that the manufacturer is equipped to manufacture.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. TARVER. Suppose it is necessary for a manufacturer to install other equipment in order to take care of such an order as was offered to the Ford Co.? Is there anything in your amendment that would authorize the Government to take it over and install the equipment itself?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. One thing about my amendment, orders will not be placed by the National Council of Defense that concerns are not able to produce. If the Ford Co. was not able to produce the article, then the National Council of Defense would not have certified that they could get that material from him. Why should a manufacturing plant that does not produce these articles be given a contract and then have the War Department or the Navy Department say, "I have given you this contract, yet you did not produce it, and we will invoke this principle upon you." The first thing to be determined is whether that plant is qualified to produce that for which you are about to contract.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Suppose there is no plant in this country qualified or equipped to do the work which the Government wants done, as, for instance, the situation when the Ford Motor Co. was requested to manufacture the Rolls-Royce engines. Could it, under the terms of the gentleman's amendment, be forced by the Government to manufacture them or to equip its plant to manufacture them?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all; not at all. The Government could step out and build a manufacturing plant itself.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman's amendment afford a more or less definite standard by which it can be determined whether a manufacturer is cooperating with the Government?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It does; and that is one of the things we did not have in the act of 1917; and sabotage could occur or "fifth column" activity could occur to reduce production; but a standard is set up under the terms of this amendment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will take the time to examine the report made by Mr. Benedict Crowell, Assistant to the Secretary of War in 1919, he will find that the charge that business did not cooperate with the Government during the late war is not supported by the facts.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I want to say right now that as I put in the RECORD the other day I propose to put in on Wednesday and every week all these contracts. Every manufacturing plant in the United States is doing everything possible to cooperate in the national-defense program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Chairman. I have just about reached the unhappy conclusion that only an act of God can protect us and save this Republic from complete disintegration. This statement sounds fantastic, does it not? Yet I am serious, so do not treat this statement lightly. I mean every word I say to you.

We are in the clutches of a well-organized group of self-admitted destroyers; destroyers of patriotism, of nationalism; destroyers of morals and Christian ideals; destroyers of character; and advocates of race degeneration. We are in the hands of the real destroyers of Christian civilization.

Who are they? They are those who sit in the inner council of the organization that controls gold and international gold credits. This is a small group, but a coterie with many ramifications, and all powerful as long as we allow them control of gold—our national wealth.

Congress can deprive them of this power and establish world peace by one master stroke; and that is deprive them of the monopoly of gold. This may be done in the following manner:

First. Repudiate all outstanding gold certificates and gold-secured investments which are held by the international bankers, the Federal Reserve bankers, and other interests outside of the Treasury.

Second. Set all gold aside for security of the American people, the rightful owners of it.

Third. Place the international bankers and the privately owned Federal Reserve bankers in the same relation to the Treasury of the United States as we, the people, are compelled to observe in relation to our local bankers.

In other words, Congress should require that the Federal Reserve bankers and international bankers place full security with our Government for money they receive from the United States Treasury.

Fourth. All money should be issued by the Government. No money should be issued in the name of any private banker or banking institution.

Fifth. Foreign government loans should be approved and made by Congress upon sound security alone. Had we insisted on such security from Great Britain and France during the World War, we would today be in the possession of the British and French Caribbean Islands.

Sixth. Private loans, foreign or domestic, may be granted by the banks only to the value of the securities that such bankers have placed in the Treasury of the United States.

Seventh. Place embargo on all gold and international gold credit until all nations return to the gold standard. This, if done today, would bring about peace within 1 month.

Eighth. Congress should then, in order to protect the people in this Nation, establish three types of banks:

(a) Banks or depositories for checking accounts; these banks to pay no interest on deposit, but always in position to pay all depositors in full within 3 months, and always prepared to meet checking accounts.

(b) Banks to be allowed to pay interest on deposits, but not required to meet the total obligations within 1 year.

(c) Banks that may pay higher rates on deposits, and therefore permitted at least 2 years to settle all deposit accounts.

This will allow depositors to share in gambling, if they feel so disposed, by placing their money in the bank with the highest interest rate. They will also share in the responsibility by placing the money in such bank; and must, if disaster overtakes such institution, wait for 2 years before they can expect settlement of their accounts.

All depositors who use group A banks are always fully protected and should be able to withdraw their total accounts any time within 1 month. Such arrangements will leave our people fully protected and the power of gold and gold credit under control of Congress and under control of the people of this Nation as provided in the Constitution. This is a brief outline of what we should do under the Constitution itself, and what must be done, instead of giving more and more power to the President, which Congress, under the Constitution, has no business to do.

Let it be understood that I have no interest in the leadership of foreign nations, or even in the nations themselves; and that includes all of them. My interest is only in the United States and in sound constitutional government, as it is the only solution of the problems that confront us today. I have no confidence in the present administration leadership, for it is hopelessly tied up in international intrigue and under the influence of foreign agents. There should, therefore, be no question as to my position, for I am definitely opposed to all foreign governments, and to Clarence Streit's world-union movement, because it is part of the British-Israel World Federation, and, therefore, destructive to the United States.

The British-Israel World Federation is no doubt financed by the same people who control gold and international gold credits. It is this small group of men who are involved in illegal exchange of securities, narcotic traffic, and international white slavery. It is up to the American people to recognize this danger before it is too late, and before we are enslaved by these international destroyers who occupy the sanctum sanctorum in their temple of gold and ill-gotten wealth.

I now wish to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that the British-Israel is mentioned in the secret report to Lloyd George which I requested to have inserted in the Record, so that the public could be informed. This request was denied me, but let it be understood that the substance matter of that report is absolutely true and can be proven paragraph by paragraph.

The American people are indeed tolerant when they allow the press and all other means of communication to be controlled and monopolized by a few people who have no interest in the welfare of the people or in the security of the United States. Make no mistake as to the power behind the various pro-English and pro-Israel groups, for they are the same people who control all publications, the cinema, radio, and all other publicity channels. The American people may, so far as truthful information is concerned, be back in the days when news was printed on the hand press and we

had no telephone, telegraph, or other modern means of communication.

The British-Israel World Federation has already undermined our Protestant Churches and is now well on the road to split the Catholic Church, which is the first step in its destruction. We can find the British-Israel in nearly every church magazine, often disguised but always there in some form or another. It is also well to bear in mind that this movement is not exclusively, as they have stated, northern Israel, for Father Divine also uses their symbol in his magazine, and his congregation can in no sense be considered northern or any other "Israel." Those of you who are not familiar with the British-Israel symbol may take a dollar bill and you will find this symbol on the reverse of the great seal of the United States. It is an unfinished pyramid, with the eye of the illuminati superimposed and with the inscription at the base of the pyramid, "Novus ordo seclorum," which means the new order of the ages. This symbol was placed on the dollar bill December 18, 1935.

Our colleges and schools are also undermined with British-Israel propaganda and our old established history and fundamental teachings are being gradually removed or substituted in all educational institutions. It takes considerable money to finance this scheme, so we may assume that it is not a poor man's movement.

The President and his associates are now engaged in the last and final attack on the ramparts of our Republic, and Congress will, if the conscription bill is passed, aid the British-Israel to consummate their plan to establish a world state. Should this plan succeed, we may look for a new King of Israel, and who is better qualified for the position than the present Duke of Windsor? He was not sent to the Bahamas on a lark, but was sent there for a definite purpose—make no mistake about that. This reads like a tale from the Arabian Nights, but do not laugh—it is liable to happen here before long, as you no doubt will find out.

#### COMMON SENSE

Is the United States threatened by any foreign power, or are we in danger of invasion by any foreign country, except England and Mexico? The answer is "No." As a matter of fact, it is hardly likely that Germany will invade England, although it is only 22 miles across the channel. It follows, therefore, that Germany cannot invade the United States, 3,000 miles remote, when she cannot conquer 22 miles.

Does England need our Army to defend the British Isles? No; because she has a larger army there now than she can feed and care for. As a matter of fact, if we are to believe the papers and the reports forthcoming from England, she is just about on the verge of winning the war, and should, therefore, not require any help from us. England admits of having lost only one battleship, two or three cruisers, and six or seven destroyers. If this is all she has lost, why are the British continually begging the United States for more destroyers? Can it be possible that it is to weaken our own first line of defense, so that we may become an easier victim for English aggression? This is something that our statesmen should consider as they bend over backward to help a foreign power that might become an enemy of the United States.

So what is it all about? Why should we break our back to help any power so well prepared and capable of taking care of herself? Can we invade Germany, France, or any other country now under German control? No. No more successfully than England invaded Norway or Germany England. The question then arises, Why have we called out the National Guard and why are we conscripting an army of millions of men? Is it to fight in Europe? Hardly—for we would be no more able to invade those countries without sustaining a greater loss than the countries now at war with each other. Our men and ships will become victims of the same attack and disaster which made it impossible for England to land in Norway, and which makes it impossible for Germany to land in England.

Then why are we conscripting an army? We are conscripting an army in order to aid Great Britain to fulfill the

British-Israel prophecy to establish a world capital in the Holy Land. Our Army and Navy will most likely be employed in Asia and Africa, for it is there the final battle is to take place. Anyone who cares to read the British-Israel publications may determine the correctness of this statement for himself; and in order to pave the road for such knowledge, I shall insert two articles by the British-Israel World Federation, so that the doubting Thomases may be better informed.

Congress has taken many steps toward world union, and as we reach the precipice, conscription and war is the last step. After that, all steps will be taken by the leaders in the administration; and do not forget that they are all pro-British and tied up in the British-Israel movement. It is in the knowledge of this that I have warned the people and Members of Congress to get back to constitutional government and set this Republic squarely on the Constitution of the United States as it was given to us in 1787.

Let us not forget that we have a well-organized "red" communistic army to the south of us in Mexico. We have a potential enemy army to the north of us in Canada; and in addition to that, a large group of Anglophiles in the United States who are more interested in returning the United States as a colony in the British Empire than they are in preserving this Republic. This group of pro-English snobs are concerned with preserving the privilege of genuflection before the British throne and association with the "damped" nobility of England.

In addition to these we have the Overseas Club, with an estimated membership of 100,000; the Pilgrims; and other Anglo-American groups. All of these "half-baked" Americans have no particular interest in the United States or in the preservation of the Republic. Their interest is entirely in the British Empire.

We also have the various endowment associations, such as the Carnegie, Twentieth Century, and the Rockefeller. All of these are pro-British and pro-British-Israel; and make no mistake about that. The most conspicuous pro-British leaders may be found in these organizations, and their influence is not directed to the welfare of the United States.

If there is to be a conscription, and if there is to be an army for foreign service, let all of these Anglophiles go first as crusaders for the British Empire. The financial backers of these groups, or the international bankers, may take their position in "no man's land," under the chairmanship of Nicholas Murray Butler. In this position they will probably be among the missing when the battle is over, and that in itself should be a blessing to the United States.

I cannot refrain from calling attention to Otmar Heffer's fully equipped army of 100,000, which, according to newspaper reports, is operating with the consent of the chief and the War Department. This army of 100,000 of communistic revolutionaries should be the first to leave the United States. Many of them, no doubt, have served under the leadership of Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin, and should, therefore, be well-versed in communistic warfare and in the performance of murder and other war atrocities. With this army we may also send the remaining Communists in the United States and their leaders, for when we get rid of them we will enjoy peace and reasonable security, as we had before we fell heir to these European cast-offs.

There is much to be done, but the most important thing for the American people is to watch their Representatives in Congress and insist that they adhere to the Constitution of the United States, for it is in that document alone the people may find protection. The people are still the power in this land of ours, and Congress is elected by the people to represent them and to protect their rights, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Congress has no more power than that granted to it in article I, section 8; and no right to liberalize or widen the meaning of the powers denied to Congress in article I, section 9. Congress has no right to reinterpret or reconstruct the powers which the States denied to themselves in article I, section 10, but must, instead, leave all power not specifically delegated to Congress to the States and to the people, as reserved by them in the tenth amendment.

Furthermore, Congress has no right to misinterpret or stretch the meaning of the powers specifically delegated to Congress, for these are fully protected by the ninth amendment to the Constitution. Taking all of this into consideration, and the fact that we are not at war, and that our security is not threatened, Congress has no right to conscript an army for active training at this time. Nor has Congress the right to borrow money on the credit of the United States as has been done up until the present time, for remember, a colossal national debt is not for the common defense or the general welfare of the United States; but is instead an instrument that will destroy the very security which Congress is supposed to preserve, protect, and defend. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, we should be able to discuss this important measure upon its merits and speak out the truth without fear of having applied to us epithets that imply we are enemies or citizens to be watched with suspicion. So far as this House is concerned, I am sure our discussion will reflect the high aims and purposes of this distinguished body.

The last stronghold of popular government is this House of Representatives, and as the days, the weeks, the months, and the years pass, it will become more obvious that the great mass of the American people depend, as a last resort, upon the good judgment, honesty, and integrity of that arm of the National Government which is nearest to the people. Presidents may fail the people, Senates may come and go, Supreme Courts may make good or bad decisions, and the people will be patient in the hope that their one arm of the Government, this House of Representatives, will right their wrongs. It is the supreme confidence which the people have in this body that makes it the bulwark of American liberties. Should this House also fail the people, the Members would be swept aside through public indignation. The people have no such immediate course to pursue against any other branch of the Government.

It is, therefore, with a complete understanding of the position we occupy in the confidence of the people of these United States, that I rise on this occasion to discuss the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill.

Nothing similar to this legislation was ever presented to the Congress of the United States. We are at peace and have so arranged our laws that we can remain at peace—if we will. While at peace and the ink on our neutrality laws has scarcely dried, we are called upon to draft every man in the United States between the ages of 21 and 45 to force him to take military training and become a member of the armed forces of the United States to be sent, if necessary, anywhere to engage in war.

We do not know whom we are to fight, when we are to fight, or where we are to fight. We are in the dark—if anyone in this Government knows the answer to these questions, he should come forward and answer now.

Those who are doing most to work up a war fever in this country will not be included in the draft, and if some may come within the draft provisions, they will enter a safe branch of the service or hide behind conscientious scruples against war. Agents of every government existing in Europe 2 years ago are here to foment the war fever. England is here now as she was in 1917 with a corps of publicity experts and financial agents of the Bank of England to induce our Government to enter this war on the side of Great Britain. This is a powerful lobby, and hooked up with our banking interest in the United States, it makes our entry into some kind of war almost certain. These interests have the money to put over propaganda; they can mold public opinion in the United States at so many dollars per inch of printed matter. Propaganda constantly before the people and adroitly conceived to arouse our anger can have no other effect than to create a war demand, especially since those who oppose war have no such fund to use.

The propaganda for sometime past has been to aid England in any way we can short of war. Everyone in this

House knows this statement to be true. Let us examine it. Just what can we do to help England short of war? I say to you that those who announce this program are either dishonest or too ignorant to be called dishonest. We are to send supplies to England—we have done that—we are doing it. We are now to send destroyers to aid England. If we do that we will be sending men to help England, but, of course, it will all be short of war.

Every one of these acts, in sending destroyers and men, will be in brazen violation of our neutrality, and it will be short of war only because Germany is too weak, after a whole year of war, to declare war on us. If we send our gunboats to England, would anyone say Germany would not have every moral argument in declaring war against us? If Germany did this, we would be at war. Does anyone doubt this? I pause for a reply.

This policy of helping England short of war is thoroughly dishonest to all belligerents and to ourselves. For the question short of war means that we lay ourselves open to the right of any country to declare war on us and then our policy short of war would be definitely war. Under this policy we leave it to any country to declare war against us, and surely no one could argue that such a declaration would not be justified.

In my humble opinion, the only reason why Germany has not already declared war on us is because she is too occupied to follow up the declaration. If we keep on, however, sending over our ships, Germany can be in no worse position by such a declaration.

I have much more respect for those who advocate our immediate alinement with England and give them our full force as support. That at least is honest. It would show clearly that we in the United States are determined to assist England at any cost, just as we did in the World War.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore say that the real issue in the minds of the American people today is: Shall we attend to our own business and keep out of a foreign war, or shall we get in and send our boys across the sea to die in foreign lands? That is the issue, and no carefully couched parliamentary tactics or remarks can convince me that we are not up against that issue now.

There are a few questions I would like to ask.

Why did we not call out the National Guard when Czechoslovakia was invaded by Germany? We have about 500,000 citizens of Bohemian blood in the United States. Why did we not pass a Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill when Poland was invaded? We have about 1,270,000 persons of Polish blood in the United States. Why did we not assemble an army when Denmark and Norway were seized by the Germans? Surely we have millions of citizens in this country of Norwegian and Danish blood. Why did we not start shooting when France was invaded? Everyone knows that we have been the closest friends of France since the days of the Revolution in the Colonies.

No, we went about our business during all this great calamity in Europe, but the moment it became apparent that England might be invaded we began to read the propaganda in the newspapers about the German invasion of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; for a brief question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The only question I would like to ask is this: Why did we not lift the embargo and permit the democratic people of Spain to have a few pieces of artillery and antiaircraft guns when they had Hitler stopped at the gates of Madrid?

Mr. BURDICK. I cannot answer for this Government.

There is not the remotest possibility of German invasion of the Western Hemisphere; and, stripped of propaganda, there is no possible way for Germany to make such an invasion even if that were Germany's purpose. But that is made to appear to draw us into the fight. Remember now, I say, to go in full blast on the side of England is much more honorable than to be doing what we are doing—furnishing them with what they want in violation of our neutrality.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman will admit that there is some possibility of Germany subjecting the British Isles.

Mr. BURDICK. It does not look that way to me; and suppose you are right, why do we have to fight England's battles?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman know that section 3 provides that the draftees shall be limited to service in this continent?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes. We talked a few days ago, however, about sending warships to England and we supposed that Congress would have something to say about it, but without consulting Congress the President of the United States calmly informed us this morning as follows:

For these reasons I have therefore taken advantage of the present opportunity to acquire them.

And he handed over the warships. How do you know but what they will hand over men next week? I do not know; the gentleman does not know. [Applause.]

Mr. CELLER. They cannot do it without our consent.

Mr. BURDICK. Oh, yes; they can. We are already involved without our consent.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. SECCOMBE. The gentleman spoke about service in this continent or in the Western Hemisphere. Does the gentleman realize that the Western Hemisphere extends from Iceland to the very tip of South America?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; it will be made to extend beyond that.

Mr. CELLER. Is not that a proper place to send them?

Mr. BURDICK. If I knew what place the President has in mind, I could answer you.

Mr. Chairman, I enjoy the conversation of these gentlemen, but I want to make a speech. I cannot yield further.

There is a reason for all this stir about England. Powerful financial interests in the United States would lose too much if the British Empire should be lost. The head of the international banking system of the world is in London and the tail is in New York. This system controls all business in both countries and a great portion of the rest of the world. It is an interest-collecting system and if that system should go down, every interest collector in the world would be lost—lost because he knows nothing but collecting interest. These men never created a dollar in their lives—they never produced. They have lived off the people—laborers, businessmen, professional men, and all other classes.

Both candidates for the Presidency are committed to the protection of this system, and the people of the United States have no candidate. Willkie is for this bill. If he had not been right with the financial interests of the country, he would not have been nominated. He opposes the conscription of wealth, but not of men. The President is all right with these same interests, so the people are out. They have no choice but to vote for one or the other of two men, both of whom are pledged to maintain the international banking system of the world. If, to give that protection, we must arm and send millions of men into the bloody pool, they will be sent in spite of what the American people can do at this election.

We should at the earliest possible moment amend the Constitution and provide for the popular election of a President of the United States. Both conventions, Republican and Democratic, were steamrollered, ballyhooed, advertised, and football yelled into both nominations, and the people have to sit home and take it.

There seems to be no issue but war in this election, and that issue is decided now. We will have war if either candidate can have his way, but there is still a great arm of the Government of the United States left to the people that cannot be—at least, I hope not—bulldozed, ballyhooed, football yelled, or advertised into deserting the plain people of this country, and that arm of the Government is this House of Representatives.

The people of the United States want to remain at peace with the world. They will fight willingly when any power attempts to interfere with our territory, but until that danger is

more apparent than it is now they do not want a universal draft. They do not want to send their sons to foreign countries to die in mockery, as they did in 1918. We fought then to make the world safe for democracy. We won the war and made the world so safe for democracy that you cannot find a democracy in Europe with a fine-tooth comb. It was a useless, asinine, and stupid experiment, and we have not yet recovered from the cost of war and our generous loans to the great democracies we were instrumental in saving.

Germany's supreme air superiority seems to be the instrument of her ruthless power; if it is, we can at least guard against the remotest chance that Germany might attack us. We can spend our money in the production of war machines for our own use and remember that we have not solved the problem of production, but there is no sane reason why we cannot. Germany succeeds because her production operates fully, swiftly, and completely. In this defense program we have arranged to spend \$15,000,000,000 on defense, and machines on land, in the air, and under the sea mean more than 10,000,000 men under arms.

In this draft we are about to impede our defense. It is clear to all, I hope, that modern warfare does not consist of a man with a gun, but a man with a machine that can overpower a thousand men. Machines, contrivances, science, skill, education, intelligence are the elements of a national defense, and if we take out of the schools 1,000,000 of our students and train them to use a gun which they cannot use in time of war we are directly interfering with the best elements of a national defense.

My plea to you is to maintain our neutrality and desist from direct violations of it; prepare for our own defense until we are actually and scientifically prepared to defend this democracy. In the meantime there is no call—no need for a universal draft. There will be time enough for that when we are threatened and war is inevitable. Let us preserve our balance, and, above all else, let us take no action that will be a violation of the confidence the American people have in this body. Let it be recorded that this House stands as the last sentinel in the defense of the people of America against selfish financial interests that would consume the life of the Nation that their dreams of financial empires should be fulfilled. Let us unite with the people in saying that we will fight for the protection of our institutions, all enemies on earth, domestic as well as foreign. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, we are debating and deliberating upon the most important issue that will confront any Member of this House. In other days of the Seventy-sixth Congress we have faced vital and important questions, but we have not faced any issue in the past which involves so many serious implications as the one now before us. It is our duty to meet the issue confronting us squarely and without flinching; we will meet it without hesitation; it is our responsibility which attaches to our deliberations and decision. Because of this it is our fundamental job to prevent any intrusion which is not strictly and thoroughly American, and we must not countenance any thought which is not strictly in accord with the principle of that which is best for the United States of America. We will meet the questions presented by the Wadsworth bill in a truly American way and for the very best interest of all of our people and our country.

Some people throughout our Nation are clamoring for a hasty national defense. Very little concern seems to be given respecting the soundness of that defense, but they want airplanes, tanks, mechanized armored units, antiaircraft guns, and men—and they want them now. They are enamored with a philosophy which has been created, I fear, because of a war hysteria which has come through the efforts of publicity handled for that very purpose. The molding of public sentiment is a very treacherous and hazardous procedure; those who would seek, by their writings, to mislead the people of our country on any vital issue are traitors to their country. I make that statement because there have been so many misleading publications respecting this very bill—now in

debate—that the public mind has been distorted, and many of our people are entirely confused regarding its provisions. The people of our Nation are entitled to know the truth respecting this bill. They have a deep interest in it and in every provision of it. They are the paymasters and they must furnish the manpower provided by this proposed legislation. A treasury which is well filled with money is one of the essential things for national defense; we do not have that very essential item of our national defense, because our Treasury is empty. The people are deeply interested in our national defense and in every problem connected therewith, because when demands are made for money the people must respond. We do not start at scratch, because we are approximately \$60,000,000,000 in the red at this very hour. We are far behind when our national-defense program begins.

Mr. Chairman, we must be aware of these facts. If we are not aware of these facts and many others respecting our Government at this very moment, we may find ourselves moving very rapidly into a situation whereby the last vestige of the foundations of democracy will be taken away from us—our liberty and freedom may be gone—even before we have been called upon to make any gesture at any defense of our Nation.

We are at peace today. I am confident that every Member of this body will continue the fight for peace. May I renew my pledge that I will assert every power and influence at my command to keep our Nation at peace. We do not want any war and we do not want to have any part in any war. We want to build in our Nation and we want to make our progress in the arts and trades of civil life. We want every man and woman, every boy and girl, to have an equal opportunity in this land, where liberty and freedom prevail. But, if we should have war, that opportunity is materially lessened. Our full opportunity in life comes to us when our country is at peace, when the efforts of men are devoted to a material progress, and when we do not seek to destroy life and property in an awful carnage.

We are all agreed that there is no opposition to a proposed conscription of manpower in time of war. It then becomes necessary to resort to the compulsory conscription of that manpower in order to build our armed forces. This becomes very essential for the protection of our people, our institutions, and our country. But a legislative enactment which provides for a compulsory peacetime conscription of our men and boys cannot be construed otherwise than as an insult to the patriotism of our people, and especially to our youth. I am speaking now for approximately 40,000 of those fine American boys who are within the age limits fixed for military service, who reside in my own congressional district. I am certain they look upon this draft of manpower in time of peace as a direct challenge of their patriotism; they wonder whether they are privileged to enjoy equal rights as citizens with the rest of us or whether they are to be placed in a fixed class—as serfs—and that others are authorized to order them around, to condemn them, and to imprison them. And, too, I wonder if they do not question what their opportunity in life will be? We are not sowing any seed of the American way by the enactment of such a policy as the one which is proposed. We are establishing a background for discord, hate, and dissension, with disgust and suspicion of our motives as the result.

Mr. Chairman, we are not at war. War is not imminent. There is no war threatened on the horizon, despite the fact that much propaganda is to the contrary. If there is, who will engage us in war, and where and when? What is the proof of it? When the President forced the cash-and-carry provisions in our Neutrality Act, that was a direct challenge to Hitler. He has continued to lead us, from that very day to this exact hour, a little nearer to this European war, which is, thank God, still 3,000 miles away, and I am convinced it will not be prosecuted in the Western Hemisphere, unless the President leads us into it.

We must keep out of this war. We want our men and boys to engage in productive enterprise on farm, in factory, mill, and in every gainful pursuit. We do not want them transferred from the lawful promotion of production to the wanton art of destruction. But now, without any war, or without

imminent danger of war, it is sought to those men and boys who are called under the peacetime draft into the military service when such a drastic method is entirely unnecessary. May I ask how many homes, jobs, businesses, and opportunities will be destroyed by this procedure? And how many of those draftees will suffer disabilities by reason of exposure to the weather and how many will suffer death? We are not ready to properly care for those men. Those who urge the passage of this measure will answer those questions, I am certain.

Had we tried in any reasonable degree to encourage voluntary enlistments, under a fair and unhampered program, and had failed to procure the personnel needed for training purposes, then we might consider this drastic step. We might, then, properly say that, although we regretted it, the youth of our land have apparently forgotten the traditions of the past, and it now becomes necessary to remind them of those treasured memories in a most forceful way. But that is not the case here. The Army and the Navy have filled every volunteer quota they sought during this year. Voluntary enlistments are pressing forward as rapidly as the men can be cared for. And, we remember, these volunteers are enlisting for the long term and at a very small pay, because those provisions have not been liberalized. Our Army now operates under the customs of the long ago, which smacks more of a monarchy than a republic. It fails to offer any inviting opportunity to our youth, yet, with all of these apparent defects, all quotas have been filled. In July 1940, 34,058 men enlisted voluntarily, and out of that number 23,432 were accepted. Likewise the quota for June was promptly filled. As of August 15 we have 280,000 men in the Regular Army, and the August enlistments have exceeded the number in July.

May I ask, Mr. Chairman, what we will do with the 900,000 men if and when they are forced into the military service? We have insufficient housing facilities for them; the necessary training equipment for war must be, in part, obtained; would we wish that these boys live in tents during the winter, and thereby subject themselves to exposure and perhaps death? We are not in war—we are in a "war hysteria." We are now subjected to the most vicious propaganda the people of this Nation have witnessed; this is calculated to excite prejudice and to mold public sentiment in favor of the passage of this unnecessary bill.

The people would like to know what the cost of this proposed plan will be. I have not heard any of the proponents of this legislation make any statement of the cost of training the National Guard, or of the training of the conscripted men under this bill. What will it cost the people? Who knows, and who will tell? The people would like to know. The entire draft machinery must be set up and operated, and that costs money. We already have all the necessary machinery for voluntary enlistments, and it does not add to the cost already incurred.

What are some of the infirmities involved in this legislation? There are many ills, but the most flagrant are the trend toward militarism and dictatorship. The dictators began their quest for greater power by establishing a peacetime compulsory conscription for military purposes—they became militaristic—and the people lost their rights as citizens and the loss of the national ideals followed. This proposed legislation will tend to destroy our American ideals that have made ours the land we must preserve at any cost. We must preserve our ideals. They must never be destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this proposed legislation. I am convinced that any plan of compulsory conscription of our manpower in time of peace, for military training, is wholly unnecessary. It is my considered judgment that since all quotas in both the Army and Navy have been filled by voluntary enlistments up to this very hour, we should continue to give our men and boys a fair and just opportunity to enlist voluntarily—before we resort to the drastic method of compulsory conscription. We must be fair about this policy, and we must admit that no liberalization has been effected and no inducements have been offered in order to procure volun-

tary enlistments. I am convinced that all of our people are entirely patriotic; they will respond voluntarily for the defense of our country. Our people have never failed their Nation—they will not fail it now.

Let us first give our voluntary enlistment plan a fair and impartial trial, under fair conditions. The time of the enlistment should be fixed at 1 year, and the pay should be increased to at least a sum equal to that paid during the last World War; those enlisting should be assured that they will not be shipped across the ocean to fight some other nations' battles on foreign soil; with these inducements, I am confident all of the personnel required for training will be procured.

Mr. Chairman, we have witnessed militarism in all its horrible "glory" in Europe. The very first policy of the dictator is to inaugurate a compulsory conscription plan for military purposes in time of peace. That policy was declared by Hitler; it was cruelly followed by Stalin, and Benito Mussolini pursued his course along the same pathway. That is the program of the dictator. They seek to dominate and control the people and their ways. We must not Hitlerize America. We must cleave a little closer to our Constitution, our liberties, and our freedom must not be destroyed in this Nation.

What is the effect, Mr. Chairman, of compulsory peacetime conscription? We may conjecture as we may desire, but it interferes with both business and industry; agriculture suffers by reason of it; men are taken from their homes, from their jobs, from their business, and from their obligations. There can be no adequate national defense without production upon the farm, in the factory and mill, and in every other productive enterprise. This proposed legislation will injure production, and to that extent it will deter our national defense. Let us not hinder and delay our defense by the passage of this bill; let us build our national defense both sound and strong so we may repel any attack from any foe; let us build it upon the patriotic impulse of our people, and defer the passage of this drastic legislation until it becomes necessary.

I am confident the good judgment of this great body will not be misled. Let us build our national defense in the American way—as Americans. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I said about 3 weeks ago from the Well of his House that if there ever was a time in our history when our Government and its representatives should be frank with the people that time is right now. Still we heard on the floor today the chairman of the powerful and important Rules Committee tell the House and the country that this is not a conscription bill. That statement shows a lack of frankness. There can be no doubt but what this is a compulsory conscription bill, and whether or not it is necessary is beside the point for the moment.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing we should keep in our minds every minute of the time we are debating this bill, and that is the fact that democracies have and can commit suicide, that a lot of the people of the world have lost their liberties not by force of arms but by the action of their then elected representatives. I have come to the conclusion, and I have come to this conclusion with regret, that the bill now before us, containing as it undoubtedly will when the roll is called the Overton-Russell amendment, or some substitute to that, and the substitute that apparently will be proposed, taking my information only from the press, is, in my opinion, worse than the original bill, inasmuch as it makes it a criminal offense for a manufacturer to refuse to accept an order from the Government on the terms the Government wants the manufacturer to accept the order. If I were the owner of an industrial plant, I would much prefer to have the Government come and take the plant, pay me for it, and be through with the transaction, than I would to have it take the industry, like it did the railroads during the World War, then at the end of 3 or 4 years have the industry turned back to me, a disorganized, run-down, and worn-out plant.

I wish I could be convinced that this is really a bill to provide training for the young men of the Nation and nothing

more than that. If that was all this bill contained there would not be 10 votes against it in the House. I wrote back to several men of military age who had written to me objecting to the passage of this legislation and asked them the specific question whether or not they would object to the bill if it contained language limiting it to training only, and with the further provision that they would not be sent out of the United States or our own possessions without their consent or until the Congress declared a state of national emergency or a state of war to exist. I sent altogether 104 of those letters, and 83 were interested enough to reply. Of the 83, 76 stated frankly that that would remove their objection; that they had no objection to giving a year of their time to military training, because, as some of them said in their letters, whether they were ever called upon to perform military service after that or not, they felt they would get certain benefits from the training and the country would get certain benefits. Whether it is true or not, I am convinced that most of the young men that will be affected by this legislation have a real fear that there is something more to this than training.

I have read the hearings before the Senate Military Affairs Committee and most of the hearings before our House Committee on Military Affairs, and from those hearings you can get any material for an argument to build up any position you want to take. For example, you will find in the hearings a statement by General Marshall to the effect that 500,000 men are what he felt were needed for war strength. To be sure, in another place in the hearings he speaks of 1,200,000 men. With the men that will be called into the service under legislation recently enacted, the National Guard bill, with our Regular Army, the National Guard, Reserve officers and retired officers and men that will be called back to service, we have today somewhere between 650,000 and 700,000 men. We can give General Marshall the 500,000 men that he himself testified he wanted for war strength. We can devote our money, if we have any left, and our energies to getting the proper and adequate equipment for those 500,000 men just as rapidly as possible and still have 150,000 officers and men available for training if we need these reserves. I do not think anyone will deny we should have in this country trained reserves. In order to get 500,000 men we have had to use every worth-while reserve force we have, our National Guard and our Reserve officers, and we are right down to rock bottom when we call them into service. I do not think there would be any objection to calling in for training 400,000 men and we would have the men to train them. I realize the argument has been advanced by General Marshall and General Shedd that this would interfere with their plans, that they are going to fit these trainees into Regular Army divisions and into National Guard divisions. We propose eventually to have nine complete divisions.

I am certainly not a military expert and I would not pose as one, but it seems to me a matter of simple arithmetic that we can take three divisions and equip them as completely as possible, having them available to go anywhere they can legally go, anywhere in the Western Hemisphere, and build up the other six divisions, using trainees to strengthen them. Just to say this would interfere with the plan they have in mind does not seem to me a sufficient answer to give the Congress, because from reading the testimony and from other things I have read, I am convinced that the War Department has for too long a time given orders to Congress instead of taking orders. We enacted a law providing for 1-year enlistment, but that was ignored and about the only 1-year enlistments we have had are those who are taking West Point examinations. If the provisions of the law passed by this Congress had been lived up to and if we had tried in the last 6 months or year to recruit the men for a year's service, we would have many more thousands of men in the service than we have today.

Mr. Chairman, I said at the outset that this bill as it comes from the committee, containing as it undoubtedly will the Overton-Russell amendment or substitute, is a greater threat to liberty and to peace than the threat or the danger we face if we do not pass the bill at all. The Over-

ton-Russell amendment provides that the Government can take over industries and facilities. Certainly the word "facilities" has been interpreted in a very broad way.

It was stated in the other body that it would include newspapers and radio stations. Even though we leave that out, to say that in peacetime—and, thank God, this is a time of peace for the United States—the Government can go in and take over an industry because the manufacturer does not want to accept an order on the terms that are offered to him, is going a long way. In other words, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and the President would be the sole judge and jury as to whether the terms offered the manufacturer were just or fair. To be sure, we had that legislation passed in 1916, but it was passed as a wartime measure. Now we are trying to write that same language into a law that will go into effect at once when the President signs it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. May I say to the gentleman that we passed, in 1931, during the Hoover administration, an act embodying exactly the provisions that were embodied in that act of 1916? We reaffirmed our belief in those provisions in 1931.

Mr. MILLER. When was that to be effective?

Mr. CELLER. During any war period.

Mr. MILLER. During any war period? I grant you that.

Mr. CELLER. However, the principle was adopted by us.

Mr. MILLER. Nobody questions that we have adopted the principle as a wartime measure, but never in peacetime. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot go along with this peacetime conscription of what I am sure is another American expeditionary force.

This time, the little white crosses, row on row, will without doubt extend from Labrador's snowy wastes to Patagonia's lonely reaches and from present indications may well stud the tropical miasmatic swamps of Sumatra and Java, in the interests of the tin can and the rubber tire. The propaganda is already having its effect and soon these sons drafted in the name of national defense may find themselves in the ranks of armies of imperialistic adventure, maintaining the interests of the British Empire in the distant East Indies. The news screen of the inspired interests of international business are this week blaring forth in the Nation's Capital these very ideas.

We might replace, if we must, the tin-plated can with one of silver in an emergency and come off financially better than to engage in a military adventure based on Singapore, step by step, from the day our envoys went to the "red" capital after the President had recognized the "red" regime in one of the many absences of the Secretary of State to Latin America, down through the Chicago bridge dedication speech in 1937, in which the quarantine of nations with an ideology differing from our own was proposed.

Out of this welter of charge and countercharge a rather clear picture is emerging. The New Deal has not changed its method—only its course. It is founded on borrow and spend. It has not and never has had a more stable foundation.

Quoting Mr. John T. Flynn, economist: On December 28, 1937, I wrote:

I wish to make four statements.

Statement No. 1: The President is about to launch a huge armament program as a means of spending money.

Statement No. 2: He is about to launch a series of war scares in order to make this armament program possible.

Statement No. 3: He will do this in order to distract attention from the disintegrating domestic situation.

Statement No. 4: He has in mind shifting public psychology from the domestic economic to the patriotic motif and to build up the slogan, Stand by the President in 1940.

I leave it to any fair mind whether this is not precisely what has happened.

Mr. Wallace poses the issue of the campaign from the Roosevelt angle, "Roosevelt or Hitler."

As for conscripting wealth, that is a natural consequence of all the rest. It goes with the farm; it is part of the inevitable sequence which Mr. Willkie actually assists; economic disintegration, increased spending, national defense as a reason for spending, huge armaments, armies, two-ocean navies, conscription, conscription of wealth, dictatorship—war. But the economic situation is not mentioned.

To be superimposed upon our present \$50,000,000,000 national debt will be this colossal armament program, now swollen past national defense into hemispheric defense. Now into a world-dominating dream of countless billions.

At home our collection of Federal taxes now three times the two billions collected in 1932 are not sufficient to cover the ordinary expenses of government, swollen to double and more the cost then. On top of this a grandiose system of farm payments, relief, public building, and social experimentation, larger in its aggregate than the whole cost of civil government in 1932; schemes which the New Deal hastens to assure will be in nowise cut or lessened. Now superimpose this wild-eyed spending in the name of national defense. The prospect of 4 years more is a debt exceeding eighty billions if that much can be borrowed; a loss of all civil rights of our citizens, regimentation, totalitarian control, and eventual bankruptcy, and then chaos.

Voluntary enlistments have not failed.

Gentlemen, these are sovereigns you are conscripting in peacetime, not subjects. You are today preparing to enter entirely new fields with our military might, following the strange devious ways of our roving ambassadors abroad.

Strange while we condemn one set of dictators abroad that we make moves looking toward cooperation with the bloodiest of them all in an Asiatic adventure.

Once more entangled in the web of European and Asiatic power politics we take the road to war, to debt, and the loss of our Republic; given the power of purse, given the power to draft the manhood of this Nation, given the terrible drive of necessity to cover domestic failure at home after the futile expenditure of \$60,000,000,000, the New Deal now drives ahead with this latest "spendkrieg."

Our destroyers already in, we enter the bloody road to war. Franklin might exclaim with Louis, "After me, the deluge." [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, a while ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] very specifically pointed out that this bill, which, if passed, is destined to change the history of the world, is not a conscription bill but a measure for selective service only. That is the most absurd and ridiculous hair-splitting statement that it has ever been my misfortune to hear upon this floor.

If the situation were not so deadly serious it would be humorous to term this bill selective, which in its very language will give the President of the United States the power to force into military service millions of American citizens, pay them the lowest salary rate in the Nation, and force them to go to jail or pay a heavy fine if they do not comply with the law. The gentleman from Illinois' interpretation of the bill as not being a conscription measure can hardly convince any person but himself.

I am thoroughly opposed to peacetime drafts, peacetime mobilizations; enforced military service is a European instrument and is probably the reason for most of the anguish and misery that has existed in Europe during the last century. Millions upon millions of Americans are Americans today because they fled from forced military service in peacetime in the countries of their origin, and here, to their dismay, they find that the very thing guaranteed them when they first saw the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor is to be installed in the last true democracy in the world.

I fancy that I have received as many letters on this draft bill as any other Member of the Congress, and my people write me not because they have been inspired by clubs or organizations or propagandists or anything else, but because they have perfectly normal Americans' distrust for the

draft; and I can say in all truthfulness that my letters opposing the draft must be at least 50 to 1 or more.

In a very thorough and painstaking survey of my district by my own newspaper staff they find the same ratio back home against the bill.

The arguments in favor of the draft, from my point of view, are not sincere and in some cases most certainly are not true. The chief reason the proponents of the draft are advocating is that enlistments are not large enough and that the enrollment system is a failure. Just this afternoon the War Department furnished me with the following figures on enlistments:

In June there were 23,441 enlistments; in July there were 33,958; the tally thus far for August is 33,880; and the Army major who gave me those figures estimated that the August total would be approximately 40,000. Precedent indicates that fall enlistments are always the heaviest, and therefore to estimate that there will be more than 50,000 per month during September, October, November, and December indicates very clearly that in addition to the Army that we now have we will have enlisted a third of a million men to train with broomsticks for guns and stovepipes for cannon. In my city of Pittsburgh 10 days ago all peacetime records for 1 day were broken.

The public press 2 weeks ago declared that an all-time, peacetime record had been broken in the third week of August for enlistments in the United States Army. A high official of the Army this morning told me there were thousands of Reserve officers who will not be called for a long time, and, furthermore, told me that there were thousands of capable men desiring to take officers' training who would not be accepted because of lack of need for them.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. The enlistments to which the gentleman referred were all for a period of 3 years, and at \$21 a month.

Mr. McDOWELL. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

One of the arguments frequently used in favor of the bill is most unfair to the present generation of youth. I have heard many, many times that the youth of America needed discipline; that this is a method of taking them off of the street corners and out of the poolrooms and teaching them good Americanism. Sincere persons should be ashamed of such an untrue and unfair charge as that, as the present generation of young people, and the last generation of young people, and the generation of young people before that were just the same. It is just a new crowd of youngsters doing the same old things we did.

I have had several years of full-time intensified military training. In my case, I enjoyed it immensely, and in my case I believe it helped me immensely; but in the case of many men who served in the same ranks as did I, military life was poison to their very careers. Good fellows they were, honest, sincere, patriotic, and loyal, but who hated the uniforms and the guns when they were not required to defend the security of the country.

It is easy for gray hairs to point out to reckless and irresponsible youth they should don the uniform and go marching off with the guns. Their sacrifice will be in watching them go. For God's sake let this Congress consider some little bit the feelings and the desires and the future of those lads who will be affected by the draft.

The time may come when I shall vote for the draft, but it is not here yet; and until I sincerely believe that our country is facing invasion, I shall not vote for the draft. I do not agree that this is a political issue. The heads of both major political parties seem to agree on the necessity of the draft. That agreement on their part does not affect me, as I am charged with carrying out the desires of the third of a million people that I represent here in Washington.

No measure before the United States Congress ever transcended in importance this thing that we consider here today. No Congress ever faced a graver responsibility than do those who will vote this week on this draft bill. If you vote up the

bill and pass it, America has turned a corner that she will never round again. Her chastity or virtue can only be once destroyed; after that it is customary.

For the sake of the young men of this Nation and for the ideals of the Nation, let us defer the draft until a time of need.

If we are going to get in this war, for God's sake let us do it honestly and not sneak in. If we are going to change our form of government, for God's sake let us do it honestly and legally. The President, a few days ago, said the draft was needed in 2 weeks. If he has received fresh and alarming news from abroad then let him tell it to us, the representatives of the people—otherwise let us vote against this imperious demand and warn officers of the Government who thwart the laws of the Congress by extra-legal means they face the threat of impeachment—the last weapon left in the hands of the people. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who are wholeheartedly in accord with the principle of what is known as the Russell-Overton amendment, an amendment adopted to the companion bill of the bill we are now considering when it was pending in the Senate, and sometimes referred to as having to do with the conscription of industry, having as its objective the forcing of recalcitrant units of industry which may refuse to do their patriotic duty in an emergency of this sort to measure up to what the American people have a right to expect of them.

I want to undertake to make some brief reference to the committee substitute for the Russell-Overton amendment, which is to be offered by the Committee on Military Affairs under its privileges under the rule which has been adopted, and in connection therewith to the substitute proposed by my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] with regard to which I had some colloquy with him when he was addressing you earlier in the afternoon.

I have not had an opportunity to compare carefully the language of the amendment which will be proposed by the committee with the language of the Russell-Overton amendment adopted in the Senate, nor have I been able to see a copy of the substitute amendment which will be proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]; but judging from his discussion of his amendment when he was on the floor and his explanation of what his amendment proposes to do, I submit to you in all fairness that the language of the committee amendment is vastly more desirable than the language of the substitute for the committee amendment which will be proposed by the gentleman from Georgia.

There is one very outstanding and, I think, perfectly valid reason for my entertaining this conclusion. The gentleman from Georgia says that under the language of his amendment, if the Government goes to a manufacturer who is equipped to manufacture and in the business of manufacturing goods of a certain type, and that manufacturer refuses to contract with the Government upon reasonable terms, the Government may then take over the plant of that manufacturer and continue its operations, paying therefor, of course, a reasonable rental based on its value.

I asked regarding the situation that arose recently when the Government undertook to contract with the Ford Motor Co. for the manufacture of an airplane motor known as the Rolls-Royce motor. As I understand, there was no plant in the United States which was equipped to manufacture that particular motor although the Ford plant with additional equipment could have undertaken the contract. Under the language of the Vinson substitute to the committee amendment the Ford Motor Co., if approached again with a similar proposal by the Government, would only have to say, "This plant is not equipped for the manufacture of Rolls-Royce motors; it is not in the business of manufacturing Rolls-Royce motors; and, therefore, there is no way under the law by which you can compel us to contract with the Government for the production of such motors on terms that may be reasonable."

It would not avail the Government anything to say, "There is no plant in the United States which is able to manufacture such motors or is at present equipped to do so, and you may, by making changes in your equipment, be able to comply with the Government's requirements."

The committee amendment, as I understand, differs from the Vinson substitute in this particular. The committee amendment provides that where a plant is capable or susceptible of being transformed readily into a plant which can manufacture the kind and type of goods required by the Government, the owner of that plant may be required to contract with the Government, even though to do so would involve the addition of equipment which he might not possess and the making of changes in his methods of manufacture.

To my mind it is desirable that the Government should possess that authority, and I certainly can see nothing wrong; I can see nothing which is tinged with sovietism, as has been said of the Russell-Overton amendment in certain high quarters, in requiring the owners of manufacturing establishments in this country to render service of the type which they are capable of rendering to the Government of the country in its time of emergency for reasonable compensation.

Mr. Chairman, within a few days it will become my duty to cast one vote as a Member of this body upon the most solemn and vital question which has come before us during my almost 14 years of service here. Call it selective service, call it compulsory military training, call it what you will. The people call it conscription. The people know, because they have felt its burden in the past and will bear it in the future if it is enacted into law.

#### LET US REALIZE WHAT WE ARE DOING

Let us have no palliatives, no sugar-coating of the pill. It is all right to talk of the advantages to young men of military training. There are undoubtedly some advantages, just as there are in many other forms of training for which no man has ever been conscripted. The sober fact remains that to conscript a man for military service is to impose upon him the heaviest burden of citizenship, and that no man in his right senses would contemplate doing it for a moment unless convinced that his country is imperiled and that its safety cannot be insured in any less drastic manner.

#### HOW DO WE KNOW THE NEED?

Let us be honest with ourselves and with our people. There are men on the floor of this House who talk wisely about the strength or weakness of our Army, our Navy, their possession or lack of adequate equipment, whether they could sustain the brunt of attack from conceivable military combinations abroad, either in their present state or as they may be improved by appropriations made by this Congress, who know little about such matters except as they are informed by experts of the Army and Navy. It is upon these experts that we must rely for truthful information about defense requirements. It is equally true that it is in considerable part upon the State Department with its diplomatic and consular service, with its contacts with every nation in the world, with its sources of information that are barred to you and me, that we must rely for authentic information as to the possibility or probability of our Nation being subjected to such attack. These are the sentinels whose duty it is in the one instance to defend us from aggression and in the other to advise us as to the possibility of aggression. And the minds of most Members of this House are going to be made up on this question, not by anything they know of their own knowledge, but by what they have been told from these authoritative sources.

Newspaper and radio propaganda we cannot trust, which is not to say that we do not have an honest and informed press as a whole or that radio, insofar as it can be, is not honestly controlled. Despite all purposes of honest men to the contrary, we know that money through the press and radio has been used before and will be used again to have the people believe whatever those who spend the money want them to believe. But if we cannot trust these men who have given their lives to the work of our War, Navy, and State Departments; if men with the sources of information possessed by Cordell Hull as Secretary of State cannot be trusted; if the

President of the United States would be traitor enough to be dishonest with his people and bring them to the verge of a war for which no need exists, then, indeed, God save America.

Because I trust these men, because I know they are in better position to know what they are talking about than I am, because when I compare their statements with what I can learn otherwise about happenings abroad I believe them to be true, I am willing to vote conscription. I am willing to do it only because I believe that our national safety depends upon it.

#### THE APPROACH OF DANGER

I have watched the present European war loom on the horizon like a cloud the size of a man's hand; I have watched it blacken the whole eastern sky; I have seen the threatening tentacles of the storm reach out to encompass our own country and practically every country on the face of the globe; and with every lightning crash, with every louder wail of the hurricane as the crescendo of hate and murder reached its zenith I have feared, as you have feared, that the gale might eventually sweep over our own country, that the lives of our own boys by the millions might be demanded as a sacrifice to the god of war, and I have sought as one Member of Congress to lend every effort in my power to the preservation of peace and freedom in this Nation.

New and powerful forces are loose in the world, born of hatred and greed, and working contrary to every principle of Christian civilization. There have been periods in history when nations observed ordinary principles of honesty and fair dealing, but this is not such a period. Most of the great nations of the world have departed from any idea of observing principles or of paying attention to solemn treaty obligations. With them today there is but one question, and that is, what do they want and whether they are able to take it. The same doctrine applied to individuals would make of them thieves and murderers. I am unable to distinguish between nations and the individuals who make up nations, so it seems to me that some of the greatest nations of the world today have become international thieves and murderers.

It is significant that in order to get their own consent to do it they had first to destroy in their lands the religion of the Christ of Bethlehem, the bedrock of modern civilization. If they succeed in their objectives, civilization as you and I have known it will be destroyed, perhaps for a hundred years, perhaps for a thousand years; but, for the time being, at least, it will be destroyed.

#### PREPAREDNESS AND PEACE

With these powers of evil loose in the world, what assurance have the American people of safety? What difference does it make if a thief says, "I'm robbing this house next door to you, but you needn't get your gun because I don't intend to rob yours"? Is there any man or woman so trusting as to be willing to rely on such assurance? There can be but one answer, and that is that the safety of America today depends upon America's ability to resist aggression. I do not mean that we must become involved in any foreign war; I do not think, if we act wisely, we will become involved in war. But I do mean that the United States must take steps to make it absolutely impossible that it could be successfully attacked by any nation in the world. That is the best assurance we can have that our sons will not have their lives snuffed out by the hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, in a bloody war; and that is the thing that is being undertaken today by almost unanimous actions of the United States Congress under the leadership of a man who, under our Constitution, is our Commander in Chief in periods of national emergency—the President of the United States.

#### DOLLARS VERSUS HUMAN LIVES

There is, of course, some measure of complaint from those who think in terms of dollars rather than of human lives and happiness and who fear the tremendous tax burden which is inevitable; but the American people would rather sacrifice all they have and retain their liberty than to sacrifice all they have and liberty, too, by permitting themselves to become the victims of aggression. Today we are talking about compulsory military service, about conscripting men. Let

there be no mistake; the American people are willing to furnish everything, even to their sons, that may be absolutely necessary for the defense of their Nation; but if the Government conscripts the sons of the people, it should conscript the dollars of the wealthy. It is unfair to take the poor man's son and place him in the battle line and only borrow the rich man's money and pay him interest on it. I do not know how long this emergency may last nor how extreme it may eventually become, but as one Member of this national law-making body I have declared, and I declare now, that I am willing to vote to give all that we have in our national defense, and that all includes money as well as men. There should be no more discrimination, no more getting rich in times of a national emergency by profiteers who fatten on the extremity of a nation while others sacrifice and suffer.

#### WILLKIE PUTS PROPERTY ABOVE PEOPLE

It has been distressful to my mind that a man who is the candidate of one of the major political parties for President of the United States has been for the last several days protesting against the conscription of industrial plants essential to national defense which may refuse to do their part. I can not conceive of such an attitude even on the part of Mr. Willkie. It is true that he said in his speech before the Economic Club of New York and the Harvard Business School Club in New York on January 21, 1935:

No duty has ever come to me in my life, even that in the service of my country, which has so appealed to my sense of social obligation, patriotism, and love of mankind as this, my obligation to say and do what I can for the preservation of public utilities, privately owned.

But even his fancied obligations to public utilities, whose servant he has been for many years, should not indicate the existence of a feeling that any corporate interest in this country in time of national emergency might refuse to do its part and not be subject to governmental control. And yet his recent statements in violent protest against the Russell-Overton amendment seem to mean just that. In effect, Mr. Willkie says, "Conscript the boys, take every mother's son if necessary and put him in the battle line, but if any munition plant, any manufacturing plant of any kind refuses to aid its Government in a national emergency, that is its privilege. Take the American boy, but do not dare to lay your hand on the American dollar."

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to take both when national peril justifies it; and if I could vote here for any course of conduct on the part of this Congress that would insure no American boy ever dying in battle I would do it if it cost every dollar that Mr. Willkie and his associates, or anybody else, have now or ever have had. I cannot do that. But at least I can vote to take the dollars along with the men, and, so help me God, I am going to do it whenever and wherever I have a chance.

I know some of the great newspapers of the country call this demagoguery. Those same papers, in the main, support Mr. Willkie's candidacy for President. To them, everything is demagoguery which does not recognize a vested right in capital to do what it pleases. I am glad that I am able to believe that the majority of the patriotic, honest American businessmen do not feel that way about it. But, so far as my vote is concerned, it is the duty of my conscience to determine what is demagoguery, and what is my solemn, sworn obligation as a Member of this House. And I expect to support the Russell-Overton amendment whenever the question it involves is before this body. If I did not do that I could never look the patriotic young men of my district in the face again. I could not say to them, "Yes, I voted to conscript you, but I would not even vote to take over an industrial plant needed to supply you with arms, or clothes, or food, when it refused to discharge that duty."

#### CONFIDENCE IN FUTURE

In my judgment, the future of our Nation is fraught with danger, but it need not be mortal danger. We are well able to protect ourselves. We are well able to make ourselves so strong we will not be attacked. I do not believe, under our present national policy, we will become involved in war; but

unless we are willing to sacrifice to build up our Army and our Navy, and our national defenses generally, there lies before us, not only the possibility but the probability of our being subjected to aggression. Some day the storm will have passed over; some day the sunshine of peace and civilized life will shine again. Whether it will be next month, next year, or 25 years or more from now, no man can tell. If it comes early that will be our blessing; but we must gird ourselves to resist the storm as long as it shall last.

We should not be unduly alarmed by those who claim that we are totally unprepared. We have the best navy in the world, and we are rapidly increasing its strength. We can have an army capable of resisting any invading force by the time we need it. We are providing equipment for that army at tremendous national expense and, of course, we would be foolish to do that without providing men to man that equipment. And if our men ever have to enter the battle line, we would be unjust to them if we sent them in to fight tanks and diving bombers, and all the other instrumentalities of modern warfare without being trained. We must, therefore, train at least a sufficient number of men. Let no mother feel that when her son receives military training he is being sent to war. He will be doing his part to prevent war, to prevent the possibility of our country being successfully attacked.

#### HOW MEN SHOULD BE SELECTED

I am glad that the present needs of our Army do not make necessary conscripting more than 900,000 or 1,000,000 men within the next year. At least that seems to be the judgment of the highest authorities. With the Senate age limits of 21 to 31, 12,000,000 young men would be within the draft age, and less than 10 percent of them would be drafted. I can see no reason, however, for the maximum age limit of 31. Many men far beyond 31 might better be able to perform efficient military service than some under 31. If conscription is to be had, it is only fair that the Army should have those men, whatever their age, who are best qualified to render the service that is needed. And, so far as I am concerned, I shall vote for much higher maximum age limits than are included in the Senate bill.

#### ACTION, NOT SPEECHES, NEEDED

I have felt some hesitancy in taking any time whatever for discussion of this very vital question, about which most men in this body, if not all, have made up their minds. It is impossible to hope that any vote will be changed by debate. The issue is one which has already been delayed too much by oratory and with regard to which there is an urgent necessity for immediate action. Under these circumstances, I would not have spoken at all, except that 2 days have been set aside for general debate and are to be consumed, and my failing to take time for debate would not in any way hasten a decision.

#### A VOTE FOR PEACE

I am voting for this bill not because I am for war but because I am against war. I pray God that our danger can and will be overcome without the sacrifice of a single American life. I think it probably will be. I know that an American Congress and an American President are working hard toward that objective today, and I believe that the prompt passage of this bill is essential, not to a war program, but to a program of peace. [Applause.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

FREEDOM OF SPEECH IS THE ONLY WAY MEN HAVE TO KNOW WHAT IS TRUTH

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, steps short of war have taken us swiftly in that direction. Three years ago we were passing a Neutrality Act which, we were told, was to be permanent legislation. A few months ago we revised it and took a step short of war. At that time it was my conviction that action set our compass and determined our course. Since then we have taken several steps short of war, all in that direction, none away from war. Today we are considering the passage of a conscription bill.

There is one phase of the so-called Overton-Russell amendment to which I wish to direct special attention. It is to that portion which speaks of the possible drafting of

facilities. A number of able commentators have suggested that this might mean control of the radio, newspapers, and magazines; in fact, would involve the whole realm of free speech and free press. Laying aside the question of constitutionality, I wish to speak briefly on the merits of such a proposition.

My position with regard to the principle of universal service in time of war is that one long announced and enunciated by the American Legion. I have gone even further and, before the Overton-Russell amendment was adopted in another body, had said on this floor:

If the emergency calls for drafting men to fight, does it not call for drafting men to work in essential industries? Is it not as logical to draft capital that does not fight as to draft soldiers that do?

In harmony with that position, and not contrary to it, I wish to draw a distinction between drafting a man's body and drafting his mind. War is an anesthetic terrible enough of itself. It does damage enough to men's minds and souls without giving an emergency the sanction to strangle men's thoughts and the rights to express them. If we do that, we shut off the only chord which can lead the world back to sanity and lay the foundations of peace.

Let me challenge any proposition that free speech should be destroyed by saying that if you destroy the right of men to speak when they see error you destroy the capacity for victory. We should not forget that in World War No. 1 it was the blunt, outspoken, patriotic criticism by Northcliffe that forced changes in the handling of ammunition, which forced changes in the British administration, without which England would have been defeated before the United States ever entered the war.

The only guaranty the human mind has of truth is the freedom to question what purports to be truth.

Someone will say, "Yes; but times are different. This is a crisis. We have an emergency."

And I would respond, recalling in substance if not in actual language, the words of a great American, the late Senator Borah, when he once said, in effect, "Freedom of speech means nothing if it means only the right to speak on a subject where all are in agreement and at times when nobody objects."

Mr. Chairman, the very time when men might not like to hear what someone wants to say is the only time that freedom of speech counts.

Men may use the language of liberalism to slay the very principles they avow, and that assertion finds tragic support when men in authority assume a closed mind and insist in closing other minds also. For, Mr. Chairman, there is no tyranny so great as that which wraps the mantle of liberalism about the body of a self-proclaimed superiority of wisdom and monopoly of truth.

Military necessity may dictate the control or release of certain factual information in wartime, dangerous as that may be to the finding of what will win and what means defeat, but certainly no peacetime emergency declared either by the Congress or the Executive warrants any statute which would destroy freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, and the freedom of men's minds to search for truth. [Applause.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it seems to be the will of the people that we here in Congress appropriate sufficient amounts of money and take whatever steps that are necessary to provide them with complete safety from invasion under any and all conditions.

I think that is what we all want, and I think that is what we are trying to get, but I wonder if we are getting it in the best possible manner.

It appears to me we are making some errors and mistakes that could be avoided if we will only do a little clear thinking on this national-defense problem at the outset.

I do not want to see this Congress make the mistakes the legislative bodies of the countries that have fallen before the Nazi-Fascist-Communist combine made. It is obvious that

modern warfare is a much changed affair from that of the last World War.

Congress can appropriate endlessly and still not give us the kind of national defense we need now. The days of great massing of foot soldiers has passed. What we need now is machines and still more machines. Airplanes, tanks, combat cars, antiaircraft guns, antitank guns, rapid-fire rifles, and things of that sort. That is what we need in vast numbers to give us an impregnable national-defense system. You do not have to be an expert on military affairs to see that.

Old methods of warfare are so obsolete that it is reliably reported that 60,000 Germans with mechanized equipment overran France's Army of more than 2,000,000 men in just a few days. That proved that men are only incidental in modern warfare—it is more machine against machine than it is man against man.

In passing, it is well to note that this Congress has appropriated approximately \$12,000,000,000 directly and in contract authorizations in the last 2 years, with another five billion on its way through the Congress at the present time.

We are advised authoritatively we need 50,000 fighting aircraft. Maybe that is the right number. I do not know. But I do know there is something decidedly wrong with our planning if we do not scatter those planes out through the country instead of concentrating them in large quantities at obviously vulnerable points.

What we need along with those 50,000 planes is hundreds, maybe thousands, of strategically located flying fields, with hidden below-ground bomb-proof hangars where they will be relatively safe from the prying eyes of an enemy force. European observers have reported that France lost most of her war planes on the ground rather than in the air, and also that the reason England is proving such a hard nut for the Germans to crack is because the English countryside is literally dotted with flying fields.

We need some exceptionally large flying fields, too. Many of the fields we now have are much too small to accommodate the Army's flying fortresses. And with even larger bombers soon to come rolling off the assembly line, it is imperative that the War Department be provided with funds to develop landing fields to accommodate these giants of the air.

So far less than 10 percent of the procurements of the National Defense Advisory Council's clearances have gone to firms located in the Middle West. An overwhelming proportion of the \$12,000,000,000 already appropriated by this Congress for national defense has been awarded to concerns located on the eastern slope of the Appalachian Mountains and the western slope of the Rockies—both being areas more or less vulnerable to air attack by an invader.

These are situations, which in my opinion, should be corrected immediately. Furthermore, I believe it would be advisable for this Congress to give the National Defense Advisory Council the power to actually order material for the Army and Navy, instead of only permitting it to "clear" procurements. The men that are serving on that committee are doing a good job now with their limited authority, but they could do a better one if they were clothed with more power.

I believe that the draft of 900,000 men into the Army is a far larger number than is needed at this time, although I am fully aware of the obvious truth of the statement that modern armies require much longer training than those of even 25 years ago. Furthermore, I am not convinced that induction of this large number of young men into the Army with its present low stock of equipment would not do more harm than good.

I think it would be a wiser course to make Army service more attractive to young men than it is now, through better educational advantages, better pay, and better housing facilities. I believe if the Army would equal Navy inducements it would be able to get all the voluntary enlistments it can handle for the time being at least.

It seems to me it would be strongly in the interest of national defense to hold off on conscription until the need for it becomes more evident than it is now, but in the meantime I

think we should go ahead and mechanize our Army as rapidly as possible, not sacrificing quality for quantity, and if the time comes when voluntary enlistments do not keep pace with the acquisition of mechanized implements of war and invasion danger is acute, then we can resort to the draft. [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES].

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, when I was a small boy living on a sand farm in Wisconsin, we hired a German youth, who had just come over from Germany, to work for us on the farm. I suppose he was about 24 or 25 years of age. He could talk very little English, but I was his tutor, and I taught him the English language in the lumberjack style. He came from Germany as a refugee. He fled. He hid himself on a Hamburg steamship and came to America. His idea was to get away from conscription, because one day, as he illustrated to us on the floor of the kitchen, in came three German soldiers, headed by a "blitzkrieging" sergeant, and stamped the butts of their muskets on the floor and said: "We want the boy." He was clever enough to get away from them, and he is now the owner of a big farm in the State of Wisconsin and has children and grandchildren, and is a naturalized citizen.

Until this morning we were at peace with the whole world. The European hurricane has missed our shores. No armed force is invading us; our ships have been free to sail all the seas except those in actual zones of war between other nations. Now we cannot tell what our definite act of belligerency may do to bring on war. When the neutrality bill was on the floor of the House, I opposed it. I called it "fraudulent," and the events of 24 hours have justified that statement. We are either wholly neutral or not at all. The latter action is the vestibule of war.

Mr. Chairman, the pitiful position of the chairman of the Rules Committee this morning when making a speech when he tried to evade the fact that this was a conscription bill with penal clauses was typical of the evasion indulged in by the proponents of this revolutionary un-American peacetime action.

We need no such army as conscription will bring.

Wars are no longer fought by masses of men. They are fought by instruments mechanized and motivated by powers other than human.

When Napoleon Bonaparte had finished his course, was on his way to St. Helena, with Elba and Waterloo behind him, with ambition atrophied, with the question of empire turned into dirty rags, with his France a great sepulcher of epauletted marshals and musket-bearing soldiers, it was found that commune after commune had no young or middle-aged men to do the work of rehabilitation. All had been conscripted; most of them had died for the greatness of France and for a burning candle of glory that had died in a flickering flame.

Conscription of men—masses of men who tilled the soil, who went about the daily business of the smith and the shopkeeper—the conscription that had taken the sons from the family and put them in the army of which they knew nothing, had been the strong arm of the despot from the day that power vested in one man had spread blood on the soil of the Eurasian Continent.

If you will read the sanguinary pages of history, that history that tells of the golden glory of conquests, from the days of Julius Caesar, Charlemagne, Gustavus Adolphus, Peter the Great, Frederik, Marlborough, in the wars of England with Holland, of Louis XIV, of Frederick the Great, of Suleiman the Sultan, and Jan Sobieski—wars of greed and horror, you will find that the common people, those who actually built these empires and kingdoms, who created the wealth, whose earnings bought the diadems and the ornaments for scepters, had nothing to say about it. Their mouths were taped with the threat of the garrote and the gallows. Freedom of speech and action were buried in the skull-laden catacombs of the past.

That is what we are doing here—closing the mouths of free people who should decide, so that they shall not decide. Their only voice is here in Congress through their Representatives.

It is not in the White House nor in the Army or the Navy. It is here in this Chamber.

No new dollar in this world ever came from a crown-wearing prince, an aristocrat in line of nobility, or an official of any government. They have been the parasites living like vampires from the blood of peasant and laborer, the artisan and the worker, the plowman and the toiler. No dollar came except from labor. Gold itself came from pick and shovel and the pan to separate the ore from its sand. Toil and labor, hard and continuous, cut down the forests, plowed the prairies, and brought into being the wealth of this, our Nation. The men who did it are the American people. We made the American way of government. We made it a nation of peace. We made it a nation ready to defend itself because it was and is a nation of homes, and every man is ready to defend his home. That was a part of their freedom, an essence of the life of America. Many had fled from conscription in armies in which they did not wish to fight for a cause of which they knew nothing.

It is 1,900 years since Christ died on the cross of Calvary that men might be free. Strange that since that time barbaric man has never let a year go by without a bloody war. Sometimes a full dozen have been fought at the same time. Strange, too, nobody ever won a war with lasting results.

Greed rode the mad horse of conquest. Bloody bodies cluttered the fields and roadways. Ignorant, stolid, sordid men, with no idea for what they fought or why they rode or had to die, marched on to death for the mystic leader who wanted something he did not have. These men had been conscripted.

Conscription is only as old as tyranny. Tyranny is as old as the world. Conscription is the right arm of despotic power. It is personal to the person in power and has no place in a republic of free people. In a free republic the defense of the nation is in the hands of the people. It is not dictated by a military cabal.

The conscription plan to regiment masses of men is outmoded. It belongs to the ages and years ago, Caesar and his legions, and let me here, as a part of these remarks, insert what has been said by Maj. Gen. John F. C. Fuller, who was Chief General Staff Officer of the British Tank Corps in 1917-18.

His studies of recruitment and training during the last World War led him to the conclusion that the future use of conscription will be limited solely to the armies of aggression for the purposes of occupation. Writing as long ago as 1928, Fuller pointed out that—

The theory of conscription has run its course, and is today growing out of date. A few years hence no conscript army will be able to face an organized attack by armed motor cars, let alone by tanks and kindred weapons.

To those who can read the past and follow present tendencies—

Fuller wrote 12 years ago—

the future development of recruitment is clear and certain. The advent of the motor-driven battle vehicle has introduced armor as an essential in tactical organization. Another armored age faces the great armies of the world, an age of costly machines in place of cheap muskets. The tendency is, consequently, one toward small armies in which quality will replace the quantity theory of the present cannon fodder masses.

In his penetrating analysis of the World War tactics Fuller saw that—

It was nothing less than a national, let alone military, crime to conscript all classes of men as if they were of equal value, and to fill the trenches which were little more than altars of human sacrifice to a discredited god, with highly skilled mechanics, miners, and professional men.

Throughout the war it was scarcely realized by any of the general staffs that the one great tactical problem was not to increase fighting manpower, but as far as it was possible to eliminate the fighting man, the human slop-butt, and to replace him by a mechanic.

In spite of tank attacks, air attacks, naval attrition, and chemical attacks, it was not realized that weapons give blows and men receive them, and that the main problem in tactics is how to give blows without receiving them, and not a mere question of human tonnage.

What we need is a mechanized army and human power of skilled and trained mechanics. We need a mobile, swiftly

moving army for our defense to be placed at high speeds at danger points. That has now been fully demonstrated. France's Army of 5,000,000 men, who knew the school of the soldier and all the niceties of dress parade, were useless against the machinery of Hitler.

We can get that army by volunteer methods when we make the soldier into a modern man with some self-respect and respect from his officers, when we pay him a wage consonant with his work and consistent with American ideas. I would give him \$35 a month, which is not a cent too much.

It has been said here on this floor that we cannot get volunteers. Listen to former Secretary of War Harry Woodring. He said:

How any fair-minded Member of Congress could say that we have given the voluntary system of enlistment for the United States Army service a fair trial and that it has broken down and therefore we need the compulsory service is beyond my understanding.

That is the statement of the man who has had longer association with Army responsibility and defense responsibility under this administration during the past 8 years than has any other man except the President himself.

I want to quote some statements by Senator VANDENBERG in the Senate debate:

Here is a news dispatch from my own State of Michigan:

"More than 900 Detroit and Michigan youths joined the United States armed forces in July, establishing a new peacetime recruiting record. Every branch reached or exceeded its quota, as 937 men were selected from more than 2,000 applicants."

A new peacetime recruiting period; every branch exceeding its requirements; yet we are told that the system is breaking down. In Detroit the Marine Corps had so many applicants that a number equal to 50 percent of the July quota is waiting for August enlistments. The services could not even take care of those who wanted to volunteer; yet the volunteer system is indicted for failing to produce the men the Nation needs.

From the same State of Michigan, at Saginaw:

"At the present time 25 men are on 'what do you suppose?'—'the waiting list, and will be assigned to various departments of the Army'—when?—'as soon as vacancies occur.'"

Down in the Carolinas, from the Charlotte Observer:

"Army enlistments for the Charlotte district broke all previous records last week when 504 men were recruited in the Carolinas."

"Broke all records." We find the same story from every corner and quarter of this land. Yet it is said that the volunteer system has broken down. It has not broken down. There must be another reason for suddenly and precipitately asking America to submit to peacetime compulsory militarism for the first time in 150 years.

Out in California—I am "sampling the Nation," as Dr. Gallup would say—the Los Angeles Evening Herald for July 31 says:

"Recruiting at the United States Army station in Los Angeles so far this month has broken all peacetime records."

Mr. President, wherever we explore the situation we seem to find the phrase, "broken all peacetime records," yet we are told that the volunteer system has broken down.

I continue:

"Navy and Marine Corps recruiting offices are crowded with applicants, and the aviation branches of all services are overenlisted and have waiting lists."

Yet we are told that the men needed cannot be obtained by relying upon the traditional volunteer system.

In Illinois, a citizen's letter in a Chicago newspaper says:

"I suggested to a young man out of a job that he join the Army. I phoned the United States Army recruiting officer for information and was told there were no vacancies. I nearly fell over in a faint. The quota full, and yet all this hullabaloo about the draft! On repeating the story to a friend I found that 27 young men in the little town of Ashley had been told there were no vacancies."

From the same State of Illinois, a letter to me dated August 7 says:

"On Tuesday, August 6, at United States Courthouse, Chicago, 23 voluntary Army recruits were turned down. Reason: Quota filled, no housing, no equipment."

Back to North Carolina. This is from the Greensboro Record:

"More rigid rules are being set for applicants. They will not be applied to applicants now on the waiting list."

My God, they cannot even take in those who are trying to get in, and yet they say the system has broken down and that it is not producing the youth power which the Nation needs.

Conscription may at some time be justified by a tragic necessity. That necessity is not here. I say a conscripted army or any other manpower army of a million or two or five million men badly armed or well armed would have no place to serve in national defense. You are going to devastate lives of men and youth who have jobs. You are going to swell the ego of someone with a Napoleonic complex and a desire to be a military hero. It is a grandeur indeed to head an army

with serried ranks of a million men in step behind to a hospitable graveyard.

Mr. Chairman, we do not need more men; we need more machines. We do not need more money; we need more use of the money. We do not need conscription, we need an American enthusiasm for protection of America.

I am opposed to conscription.

I am opposed to America getting into war.

I feel the American people will support me in this attitude.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECCOMBE].

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, no legislation is more misunderstood at the present time I believe than is the pending bill. I believe we are failing to call it by its first name. There has been the feeling here today among my colleagues that this is a selective-training bill, and were it a selective-training bill I would be for it. But let us call it by its first name. It is a compulsory military-training bill, and let us not kid ourselves. Once this bill is passed you are not going on a cruise, you are not going on a vacation, you are not going to sleep in white beds. If you think you are, you are just as crazy as—well, you are mistaken, that is all. The sponsors of this bill would like to change the title of the bill, and give it a silk-stocking title, and not have the word "compulsory" coupled up with it.

Who are the sponsors of this bill? They do not come from the poor people, or the young people, or the working class, they come from the people who have practically nothing to give but all to take, the munition makers and international bankers, and in the end who will do the suffering, so to speak? Not the rich, but the poor.

I think I can speak from experience, like many of the other Members, and I do it without any apology. I served in the World War. I enlisted, and I am proud of it. Nevertheless, we are at peace, and this is a time when we must have some cool thinking and such thorough discussion and consideration that there can be no misunderstanding and go into this with our eyes open. I think we will all agree that "Western Hemisphere" is interpreted to mean from Greenland to the end of South America; still we ask: Are our boys to stay within the United States? The answer is under this bill—"No."

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SECCOMBE. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman served in the World War and he knows that when a captain goes over the top ahead of his company it inspires confidence in those men.

Mr. SECCOMBE. That is right.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Then why should the Members of Congress, other politicians, and aliens be exempt from compulsory military service under this bill? If the danger is so great as to warrant the compulsory conscription of men for military service in peacetime why should not Members of Congress up to the age of 65 be specifically included in the first draft so that they can serve Uncle Sam for \$21 a month in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps instead of their \$10,000-a-year salaries and thereby let the country know that they are going to lead in this emergency the same as a captain who goes over the top at the head of his company?

Mr. SECCOMBE. I am in favor of it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And why should we exempt millions of aliens, including many who have recently arrived from abroad, people like the Rothschilds and others who have come into the United States in droves during the past few years?

Mr. SECCOMBE. I am in favor of including Members of Congress in their entirety. I think they should be included. I do not think anybody should be exempt.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The military service of Members of Congress can start after their present term of office expires. Those who support this peacetime compulsory military service bill should be the first to be taken into active

military service under its provisions. The people can elect others to take their places in the next Congress.

Mr. SECCOMBE. That is all right with me.

As to the alien, he is exempt from service under this bill. I do not say anything about the alien who has not had the privilege of his first papers, but if we are going to have a compulsory military training bill then let us not exempt anybody.

Let us take the rich, the poor, and everyone in.

Let us include everybody. [Applause.]

I want to go back to section 10. Under section 10, if you evade this registration, you are going to be penalized. Just read the section. It says right here very clearly:

Anyone who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making, of any false, improper, or incorrect registration shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for 5 years, and also failure to register and comply with this act shall be so fined and imprisoned.

If a Member of Congress even, after we adjourned, went home and went out and talked against conscription, he could be thrown into jail and fined \$10,000 and imprisoned for 5 years, under that section. There is a good deal more in this act than the mere freedom of the people, and these people have a right to come here and voice their sentiments.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SECCOMBE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. With regard to restricting the use of these boys in the Western Hemisphere, I believe the gentleman will agree with me when I say that those words, "Western Hemisphere," were put in for the purpose of easing up the pressure against this bill. It is very, very conceivable, however, that all we have to do is just add a couple of more degrees to the hysteria which has been manufactured in this country, and we can convene the House and the Senate and repeal those two words, "Western Hemisphere," in exactly 24 hours. As a matter of fact, we do not have to do that any more. All we have to do is to get an opinion from the present Attorney General. [Applause.]

Mr. SECCOMBE. In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make it known that I have voted for every national-defense measure the President has requested and I am in favor of some form of military training but I cannot support the provisions as contained in this bill as they are certainly drastic and dictatorial and of too permanent a nature and only short of a declaration of war itself to suit me. I personally feel that the people generally in my district are for some form of military training if they could be assured that it was to defend America and not to send troops to Europe. So why fool the people by this phoney bill under the guise of calling it "selective training," when it is the first step toward dictatorship and also the goose step. As a matter of fact, if we are to conscript the youth of our land then why not conscript the wealth of the land also. [Applause.] Let me remind you also of the obligation we assume in conscripting this great army in providing for them proper equipment, clothing, food, shelter, and hospitalization, notwithstanding the assurance that it is to be only during an emergency.

Who is to determine when and what constitutes an emergency? Is it to be the voice of the people? No; not at all, it is to be those drunk with power who would plunge this country in war itself to further their own political gain.

Why play politics with the peace and security of America when it is not necessary and such an emergency does not exist?

Let us be fair and honest to those we represent and prepare a military-training program on a peacetime basis and not use Hitler-like methods when it is not necessary. [Applause.]

I, therefore, hope and trust that every Member of this honorable body will search his own heart before voting for this bill which to me is absolutely un-American and place his patriotism above his greed and political affiliations. [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the measure which we have before us is one of the most controversial that any Congress has been called to pass upon. As we meet here today, after 8 months of continuous session, the eyes of the country are upon us. This is a time of crisis, not only in the affairs of our own Nation but in world affairs as well. The very history of humanity may be greatly influenced by what we do here.

There are none of us but that realize the seriousness and the importance of our deliberations. Each and every one of us wants to do only that which is best and that which is right. Partisanship has no place in the consideration of the problem before us. Only the purest of patriotic impulses must guide our actions. It is our prayer that we be given the wisdom, the courage, and the Divine inspiration to bring forth a proper solution of this problem.

In discussing the issue before us let us remember that this measure does not provide for universal military training but for the conscription of an army. We must not forget that this bill does not set up a long-time program of universal training but only a short-time arrangement for the impressment of men into military service. Universal military training provides that all the youth of the country, as they reach a certain age or place in life, must, as each year rolls around, take military training as a part of their normal regular life and then be subject to the call of their country for a length of time thereunder. Conscription, as outlined in this act, provides that only a portion of the men of the country, according to lot, shall be called for military service.

Conscription, whether it be of manpower, of production facilities, or of wealth, is an action that is foreign to the American way of life. Conscription, in any form, carries with it the loss of individual rights, freedom, and liberty. Conscription is an arbitrary action which centers unusual power in the hands of the few. Conscription calls a halt to individual initiative and individual action. Conscription substitutes the judgment and the intelligence of the few for those of the many.

Therefore conscription is an action that should be taken only in dire extremity and only after it becomes apparent that absolute necessity requires the rights and the privileges of the individual be sacrificed upon the altar of patriotism for the safety and the good of all.

So in considering this measure we must of necessity determine in our own minds if the situation which confronts us is of such grave portent as to require the setting aside of the constitutional and long-established rights of the individual that our Nation and society, as we have known it, may survive. Whatever step is taken must be with the full knowledge and realization that one form of conscription inevitably leads to another and that the centralization of power in the hands of the few is always dangerous. We must never forget that the priceless rights now enjoyed by the individual have come as the result of centuries of bloodshed, struggle, and sacrifice. Such rights once given away will not be easily recovered. This Congress must not cast lightly aside the rights of any individual. It is our duty and our responsibility to safeguard and protect the rights, liberty, and freedom of the individual. It is only through us that the individual has a voice in government. We are the people. Ours is a solemn responsibility.

Our Government has resorted to the conscription of manpower for its own safety and protection on but two previous occasions. Each time our Nation was at war. Never in the past have we resorted to peacetime conscription. This is the first proposal for the conscription of men, and perhaps of property, in peacetime. We are asked to establish a new precedent. We are told that our country is in danger, that times and conditions have changed, and that prompt approval of this measure is vitally necessary.

Knowing that this membership wants to do only that which is best for our country, and believing that all of us stand ready to support any legislation that we may become convinced is necessary for the safety and welfare of this Nation,

our first responsibility is, of course, to determine in our own minds whether or not this legislation is necessary at this time. To do this, reason dictates that we should pause for a little while to consider the present situation and to ask of ourselves, and of those in high authority best able to obtain correct information, a number of pertinent questions.

Is not the hue and cry for conscription based entirely upon the thesis that Britain will be defeated and that the axis powers will endeavor to invade the United States or threaten our security through invasion of some other portion of the Western Hemisphere?

Or is the demand for conscription coming because of some plan or commitment on our part to enter the European conflict?

In order for the Congress to pass intelligently upon this question we should know whether any commitments have been made, either actual or implied, to any foreign power that the United States will enter this war. Congress should be given all possible information as to the likely outcome of the present conflict. If England is crushed, what is the likelihood of an attempted invasion of the United States or the Western Hemisphere by armed forces from Europe? What are the chances for the success of such an invasion? What is necessary for us to do to successfully repel such an invasion of the United States? What further steps will be necessary to safeguard the entire Western Hemisphere?

What is the present condition of the American Navy and the American Army? What is actually needed to make both great branches of our national defense sufficiently strong to safeguard and protect our interests? What type of an army is actually needed to repel invasion? What is the actual need for manpower, for equipment, for matériel, for armament in order that we may properly defend our country?

What is our national-defense program?

What progress has been made toward getting it under way?

What is the truth?

These are some of the questions to which this body must have the answers in order to intelligently pass on this bill. Without such answers we will be simply gambling with our votes and with the rights and liberties of our citizens and the manhood and wealth of our country.

It will be contended by some that the information needed to properly answer these questions cannot be made public without danger. If such be the case, then let the information be given to the Congress in executive session and in sworn secrecy. We, too, are officers of the Nation. We are representatives of the people. If any official of this Government has any information that we do not have as to any dangers that threaten our Nation, then it is the patriotic duty of such official to furnish this Congress with the information that we may take all necessary steps to properly meet such threats of danger.

Like the country, the Congress is becoming confused in its thinking. The confusion comes as a natural consequence from the various statements, reports, and testimony presented to us and as a result of the artful endeavors of master propagandists.

We have been told by the chief of our Army and even by the President himself that our greatest need was for a completely mechanized, highly skilled, and well-trained army of five hundred thousand to a million men, extremely mobile and quick to strike, in order to defend this Nation. Congress quickly appropriated the money requested for this mechanized army. Today, according to official sources, we have more than 900,000 men in our armed forces. By December 1 the peacetime strength of our forces will be more than 1,000,000 men. Now we are told we must have an army of at least 2,000,000 men, and probably 4,000,000 or more. Why the change? Is it because we contemplate an offensive war rather than a defensive war? Can it be that our leaders are turning their backs on the need for mechanized war equipment? France had 6,000,000 riflemen, most of them conscripted, but she lacked mechanized implements of war. Are

we forgetting so soon the lesson taught in the Lowland Countries and in France that it was not manpower that counted but machines of destruction and the ability to use them?

We are told that needed manpower for our armies cannot be obtained through the volunteer system. Yet at the same time we receive information that the enlistment quotas for the Army are being more than filled and that the Army will be recruited to full strength by December 1, and that some branches of the service already have a waiting list, as does the Navy. No real attempt is being made to expand the volunteer system and to give it a fair trial. We are refusing admission to the Army of those who seek to volunteer through restrictive entrance requirements, while at the same time planning on training millions of men under far less stringent requirements. We are being asked to vote conscription while receiving complaints that it is practically impossible for Negro men to be taken into the Army as volunteers, even though thousands of them are ready to serve.

We were first told that the so-called National Guard training bill, which we passed here recently, was but for the purpose of giving more intensive training to our National Guard and Reserves in the arts of mechanized warfare, only to have it develop on this floor that the real power sought in the bill was not for the training of troops but for the right of the President to send them out of the United States into foreign countries as a military expeditionary force without consent of the Congress or the declaration of war.

The confusion in the public mind, and perhaps in the minds of some Congressmen, has been added to by statements of the President as to military equipment, "on hand and on order." We were told by Cabinet officials weeks ago that Great Britain would be defeated within 30 days and that an attempt to invade the United States would in all probability come immediately thereafter. A few days later we were asked to pass legislation that little children might be brought here from the war zone because "the United States is the only safe haven left for these little children."

We are being opportunized to pass legislation permitting the sale of American fighting ships to England on the thesis that we do not need them, while at the same time being called upon to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers money for construction of like craft as vitally necessary to our national defense. We are being told that Great Britain faces quick defeat and loss of the British Navy and that those great war vessels would be immediately turned against us. Yet at the same time almost our entire Navy remains thousands of miles away in the far Pacific—days and weeks from the Atlantic seaboard, supposedly threatened with invasion from Europe.

We are seeing agreements being made with foreign powers at Habana and elsewhere that will bind the United States to future action, the exact purport of which we do not know. These agreements are not treaties made in the usual manner and subject to the approval of the Senate of the United States, as provided in the Constitution, but purely personal agreements made by the Chief Executive or his representatives.

We have been told in a public statement by the President that the Government now has on hand all necessary equipment and facilities to properly care for the immediate training of the increase in the Regular Army, the National Guard, and Reserves called into service, and all draftees brought in under this act should it become law. At the same time we receive reports of volunteers enlisting in the Regular Army being unable to start their training promptly because of lack of uniforms, clothing, and other needed military equipment. Some of us have seen with our own eyes National Guard units drilling and training with dummy guns made from downspouting and stovepipes. We have photographic evidence of National Guard men participating in mock warfare with all sorts of substitutes for armament and matériel to such an extent as to be laughable were it not so serious.

We are being told that this measure must be rushed through into law immediately, and that even 2 weeks' delay would mean the loss of a year in training. We are being told that

there is not time to give the volunteer enlistment system a trial until January or for even 60 days. Yet high Army officers appear before congressional committees and testify that the plans for calling the National Guard and Reserves into service provide for a staggered schedule of fifty or sixty thousand men every few weeks, with the last of the troops being called December 30, because such guard men and Reserves cannot be assimilated or cared for in the United States more rapidly.

William S. Knudsen, head of the National Defense Council, testifies before a Senate committee that "it will be 1942 before there will be complete equipment for 750,000 men, and we have 900,000 men in the service right now.

We are told that orders for thousands of fighting planes have been placed and that the work of production has actually been started on many of them. From other governmental sources we are informed that only a few such planes have been ordered and that placing of orders and the manufacturing of planes and other needed war supplies has been delayed because of needed changes in tax laws.

We are requested to pass appropriations for the construction of dams in the Tennessee Valley, in expansion of the T. V. A. experimental program, under the plea that the same is necessary to provide proper national defense. This in spite of the fact that twice as much power could be obtained in half the time by erection of a steam plant at the same cost; and in spite of the fact that millions upon millions of electric horsepower are unused and available in this country at the present time. Almost every measure that comes before us is designated as an emergency necessary to the national defense regardless of its purpose or its purport.

Hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers money are being appropriated for loans to foreign countries, especially South America, for buying agricultural surpluses, establishing manufacturing plants, public utilities, and so forth, supposedly to create good will for America and to aid in our national defense, regardless of the effects on our own markets and labor. At the same time we are creating a huge deficit in the United States Treasury greater than ever dreamed of before. No attempt is seemingly being made to reduce the cost of governmental divisions other than those connected with national defense, or to eliminate any of the governmental activities which have become more unneeded and more valueless as the national-defense program gets under way.

New tax laws are passed placing additional burdens upon our people but the executive and administrative branch of Government refuses to tighten its belt financially or to exercise economy. The mad dance of wasteful extravagance and wild spending continues unabated despite the warnings of danger ahead. The spend-lend program of 1939 was defeated in these Halls. The spend-lend program of 1940, far greater in its scope than that of 1939, is in full swing.

Surely if we are threatened with invasion and subjugation at the hands of a foreign tyrant, making necessary the consideration of the conscription of men, manufacturing resources and wealth, then we should be husbanding our resources, eliminating all governmental endeavors except the very fundamentals, and devoting all of our time, energy, and resources to the defense of our country and the protection of our national life.

We are told that our Government is endeavoring to keep us out of war. Yet when we look at the record we find that high officials are issuing bombastic and inflammatory statements certainly not peaceful in nature or intent. An American Ambassador stands on the steps of Independence Hall and incites the American people to enter the disastrous European conflict and urges that pressure be put on this Congress to immediately take actions that are further steps toward war. Criticism of the address immediately brings endorsement and commendation from high official sources. At the same time another American Ambassador, who by inference alone is critical of the actions of a friendly belligerent, is immediately called home beneath a cloud of criticism.

The gentle First Lady sponsors a showing of an inflammatory motion picture produced by one of the belligerents for war-propaganda purposes. Numerous other official and personal activities, as well as masterful propaganda, all are pushing us step by step nearer to war.

Remembering some of the happenings prior to the last World War, we have the right to insist that if there is any plan, or agreement, or policy, or program to take the United States into this war, then by all that is honest and holy the people of the United States have the right to know what is going on. Nearly a quarter of a century ago much was said relative to "open covenants openly arrived at." Let that policy once more be our policy.

Let us remember that the moment the United States becomes involved in war, liberty and freedom as we have known them are no more, constitutional government disappears, and the Chief Executive becomes vested with dictatorial powers.

It is my belief that if we were at war today, and Congress was convinced that conscription was of absolute necessity for the protection of our country and the continuation of our liberty and freedom, almost a solid vote would be cast for the conscription of any and all of our resources believed necessary for proper defense, and that the Members of this body would be willing and ready to serve wherever needed most.

So it seems to me that the question we must pass upon is whether or not conscription is needed and necessary at this time with America at peace. If we believe the United States is planning on entering the European conflict within the very near future, or that our country is in immediate danger of invasion, then we should vote for this measure. Make no mistake. This bill is a step in preparation for war. Under no other condition can it be justified.

However, if we believe that America is to remain at peace and that there is no present danger of invasion, then we should vote against this measure.

In voting on this bill we must not overlook the fact that one form of conscription inevitably leads to another; that the conscription of men brings the conscription of industrial plants; that the conscription of industrial plants brings conscription of labor; that the conscription of industrial plants and of labor brings on the conscription of raw materials and natural resources; and, finally, the conscription of agriculture and of wealth. And that when general conscription becomes the law of the land America is no longer a free country.

There are those who insist that a Member of Congress must vote for this measure to be patriotic. In answer let me say that true patriotism calls for us to vote only as our judgment and honest intelligence tell us is for the best interests of our country. To vote for conscription, and all the violations of personal rights that go with it, when actually unnecessary, and to place in the hands of the few the liberty and the freedom of the masses, would be just as unpatriotic as to vote against conscription once the proof of imperative need is presented. We can have our priceless heritage of liberty and freedom destroyed from within as well as from without. Our sworn and solemn duty is to protect our country against all enemies and all dangers, domestic and foreign.

As we act here let us not forget that the greatest responsibility that is ours is keeping America at peace with the world. Peace with honor, and the maintenance of human liberty under law, and the continuation of the only free and representative government in the world, are our responsibilities.

My one fear is that in our hate of dictatorship, in our sympathy for the oppressed of other lands, and in our burning desire to protect liberty and freedom, we may take the very steps that in the end will lead to our embracing the very form of government we now oppose, and to our losing the very liberty and freedom we are endeavoring to protect.

Each of us within our own hearts and souls must find the answer as to how we shall vote. It is my prayer and my hope that we may do only that which will benefit our beloved America. [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is a wide difference of opinion concerning the conscription bill. I bear no ill will to any man who differs from my viewpoint, unless it is based on a partisan matter, and I am afraid there is too much of that in this bill. I am tremendously interested in the bill and I mean to do the right thing as far as I can for everyone concerned. A man who has raised eight boys and girls up to manhood and womanhood has a stake in this Government. I want to do the best I can for the youth of the land and for the people generally. I want to try to maintain our liberties.

We have appropriated money here recklessly, and the people have approved of it, as though the appropriation of money would solve our problems, both national and international, but it seems that is not the case. The Commander in Chief has not shown us that an emergency exists which warrants compulsory military training at this time.

The facts are these: The fleet is our first line of defense and we have 7,000 qualified volunteers waiting to get in there and no place to use them. If I am rightly informed, we have volunteers for the Army beyond what we can use. I know of recruiting stations where men have been turned down in groups recently because there was no place to put them.

They say the defense program has bogged down, but if it has it is not because the Congress has failed. The Congress has supplied the funds, which is all we can do. If it has bogged down, it is because it is in the hands of a group of partisans who are incompetent to handle the thing. We need mechanics, and the way to get these mechanics is to open the doors and let industry take in apprentices to train to be mechanics; but the administration will not hear of that. It wants to spend \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 to establish schools to train mechanics, but they will never build battleships that way.

If I am rightly informed, the President, under his program of full speed ahead, has given vast contrasts out to certain men in the country without any competitive bidding. A certain favored crowd evidently have what they want, and now it has come to the minds of some men in the departments that we should stop these profits and limit them to 8 percent. This is causing some trouble, too. The bill as amended in the Senate makes this impossible.

My love for liberty will not permit me to support this. On the other hand, when the Commander in Chief shows me that an actual emergency exists which warrants the raising of a large armed force, then my love for liberty and my sense of fairness will compel me to support a bill for compulsory military training, and not until then.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What is the use of spending billions of dollars to provide for an adequate national defense, when the President deliberately, like Benedict Arnold, betrays the country, and sells essential portions of our national defense, including naval vessels, guns, munitions, and so forth, and sends them 3,000 miles across the sea to a foreign belligerent nation?

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman. The President now has about \$10,000,000,000 of money and blank checks which he can use to push this program ahead. Why does he not work it out? We see, on the other hand, that vast amounts of money are being used for things other than national defense. These are the things that will compel me to vote against the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, just before our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] left the floor I counted the number of Members on the floor. Fewer than 50 Members of the House are present to listen to the arguments offered in connection with this, the most important issue we have yet considered.

I am wondering if in our passion to save European civilization we are not forgetting the United States of America. I

recall the attitude of the peoples of the world toward this country after the World War. We went in as a Christian nation, with the fine ideal of making the world safe for democracy. When we came out of the war we were just about the most hated nation in the world. As a matter of fact, throughout the world they referred to us as Shylocks, because we kept books here and because we reminded them that they had borrowed some money from us.

Much has been said here today about the provision in this proposal that confines these conscripted men to service in the Western Hemisphere. You say that is the proposed law. We have had the experience with Franklin Roosevelt that he pays no attention to the law. One of these experiences we had only today. The law provides, and I am sure you will find it, since it was enacted during the administration of President Woodrow Wilson on June 15, 1917, that—

During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war with any intent or under any agreement that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States.

That was and still is the law.

I call your attention to other conduct of the present President of the United States. Every action of his has indicated during all the time he has been in public life that he considers himself greater than the law. Last night I read John T. Flynn's book entitled "The Country Squire in the White House." Everyone of you recognize John T. Flynn as an able writer on politics and economics. He said in that book that in 1918, in Brooklyn, N. Y., while President Roosevelt was the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he gleefully boasted that he had smashed so much red tape and law surrounding Navy contract-letting that he could have been put in jail for 999 years. He made that boast himself.

Now you propose turning over a million men to him to play with like checkers on a checkerboard, when he admits that while Assistant Secretary of the Navy he violated so many laws that he might have served in jail for 999 years.

When the World War was over in July 1919, in fact, 9 months after the World War had ended, he had let contracts for 10 cruisers and 97 destroyers at a cost to the taxpayers of \$181,000,000, and he let these contracts on the cost-plus basis. This meant that the builders could continue on a "haste and waste" basis and be guaranteed a profit no matter what the cost. We are now sending these destroyers abroad. If any destroyers are to be sent, and there is some merit, possibly, in the sending of them, that is the right of the Congress, according to the law, and not of the President of the United States. The President is usurping the power of this Congress by so doing.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the sending of these 50 ships, regardless of what we may think of it as individuals, smack of dictatorship? Something that is as important as that should have been taken up by the Congress and the Congress should have taken the action rather than the President.

Mr. BENDER. I have received letters from my constituents, who know the law, asking how we feel about selling these destroyers or turning them over to the English. They know the law and you know the law.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Is there any doubt in the mind of the gentleman that we are not already at war and have been at war for some months? We are certainly not neutral.

Mr. BENDER. I have here an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of July 13. It is stated that this article was written on June 10. The first paragraph reads as follows:

With no notice to the American people or to the Congress that is supposed to interpret their will, this country entered the war 4 days ago. Stranger than the fact was the passive acceptance of it.

In the beginning Roosevelt sent over "obsolete" planes—and if the planes were obsolete, what in the world could the British do with them—then he sent over "obsolete" guns, now he is sending "obsolete" warships, and pretty soon he will be sending "obsolete" men. Any device at all that suits the convenience of the President is used in order to get us into this war by the back door. I say that it is essential for us to take inventory and understand what is happening to us, and tell the people of America what is happening to them—that we are being taken into socialism by the back door and being taken into the World War by the back door.

The United States now has 350,000 men in the Regular Army. There are 270,000 men in the National Guard. There are 109,000 men in the Reserve. This makes a total of 729,000 men.

But the Chief of Staff of the Army, only a short time ago, testified before a Senate committee that there is not now on hand enough equipment properly to take care of 75,000 soldiers.

There is not enough material on hand to mechanize for modern warfare more than one brigade—that is to say, enough equipment for about 4,000 men.

Sufficient equipment for an army of 750,000 men will not be ready for another 2 years.

Modern armies are mechanized units, manned by highly skilled mechanics; they are not marching troops for parade-ground purposes.

Why then 270,000 National Guard men, and—on top of these—2,000,000 raw recruits to drill with nothing more than broomsticks?

Whom are they going to fight? When are they going to fight? What are they going to fight with? And, most important of all, where are they going to fight?

President Roosevelt has pledged his word to Congress and to the people that not one American doughboy will be sent abroad.

Whom are they going to battle, then, on American soil?

What is this serious situation that has arisen which requires immediate action?

It must be startling because, only a few months ago, Mr. Roosevelt told the newspapermen that Congress should adjourn; that the only reason he could see for their remaining in Washington was to make campaign speeches.

Something must have come up to have changed his mind.

What is it?

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the industrious gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Should the gentleman criticize our ex-international banker, New Deal "fuehrer," Mr. Roosevelt, who unfortunately is afflicted with hallucinations and delusions of grandeur the same as Herr Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini which cause these four dictators to believe that they are the only capable persons in their nations, created by God to rule those nations with an iron hand, irrespective of law and the right of men?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman answer his own question.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I note in the President's message to Congress today that we are acquiring these sites for bases in exchange for 50 of our over-age destroyers. It is true that these destroyers were built during the World War.

They have been kept in stand-by, perfect condition since and within the last few months and at considerable expense they have been reconditioned or made as good as new, put in the service and are at this good hour plying the seas on patrol duty as a part of our national defense. How can the President, if this is true, certify, as he must do before he transfers these ships, that they are obsolete and of no value to our Navy?

Mr. BENDER. He cannot, but he has. While we are talking about conscription for the United States, peacetime conscription, I remind you that Canada has been in the war for a year—a year ago today Canada entered the war—and there is no conscription of men in Canada. Australia has been in the war for a year and there is no conscription there. Why conscription in the United States of America during peacetime?

The power of peacetime conscription, in the hands of an administration that has proved by its record to have utilized every conceivable excuse for regimenting America overturning all tradition and changing our form of government, is nothing but an invitation to disaster. If our country were at war, there would be no other alternative than to take this chance. But we are not at war.

I would like to read, in closing, from the words of James Madison at the time of the Federal Convention, and James Madison might be speaking today because his words are certainly prophetic and this is what James Madison said:

In time of actual war, great discretionary powers are constantly given to the Executive Magistrate. Constant apprehension of war, has the same tendency to render the head too large for the body. A standing military force, with an overgrown Executive, will not long be safe companions to liberty. The means of defense against foreign dangers have been always the instruments of tyranny at home. Among the Romans it was a standing maxim to excite war whenever a revolt apprehended. Throughout all Europe the armies kept up under the pretext of defending have enslaved the people.

Some 25 years later, speaking in the House of Representatives against a proposed conscription bill, Daniel Webster offered an indictment that is just as applicable today. He said:

It is time for Congress to examine and decide for itself. It has taken things on trust long enough. It has followed executive recommendations till there remains no hope of finding safety in that path. What is there, sir, that makes it the duty of this people now to grant new confidence to the administration and to surrender their most important rights to its discretion? On what merits of its own does it rest this extraordinary claim? When it calls thus loudly for the treasure and the lives of the people, what pledge does it offer that it will not waste all in the same preposterous pursuits which have hitherto engaged it? In the failure of all past promises, do we see any assurance of future performance? Are we to measure out our confidence in proportion to our disgrace and now at last to grant away everything because all that we have heretofore granted has been wasted or misapplied? What is there in our condition that bespeaks a wise or an able government? What is the evidence that the protection of the country is the object principally regarded?

This gentleman in the White House wants these powers. I do not know whether the next election has any connection with it but, certainly, there is some reason, some all-absorbing reason, for his wanting this extraordinary power while we are at peace. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to make a speech here about how this bill looks to me and I will be glad to be corrected as I go along by anybody who feels that I am making a mistake.

#### THE DANGER

I want first of all to read a short quotation from a man by the name of Hanson Baldwin, who is the military expert of the New York Times. Here is what Mr. Baldwin says in an article in Harper's magazine:

Invocation of a compulsory act has many arguments in its favor, but it should be clearly understood that its adoption would create a profound, lasting, and inescapable change in the economic, social, and political life of our country and might well retard the growth of our civilization. A measure of such consequence, if enacted in time of peace, may become a permanent part of our institutions. It should not, therefore, be considered by Congress in this era of hysteria, but if intended as a permanent measure only in time of calm calculation. On the other hand, if conscription is needed merely as a temporary emergency measure to last for the duration of the emergency, then the emergency ought to be defined.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield, but I would point out to the gentleman that that is a quotation and I have not said anything myself.

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman quoted Mr. Baldwin as a military expert, I believe.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did.

Mr. FADDIS. Would the gentleman check Mr. Baldwin as a military expert against the Chief of Staff of the United States Army?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know that that is the point at issue here, and I would rather not get into a controversy right off the bat. I am quoting Mr. Baldwin's opinion on the social and economic consequences of the passage of a conscription measure. I do not, certainly, want to set myself up as any kind of military expert either, but I do believe there is a great deal in what he says, and one of the things that concerns me the most about this proposition is the fact that in many cases this bill is being taken far too much for granted and without a deep concern about what may happen unless it is surrounded with the greatest possible safeguards. [Applause.] This measure will mark the most far-reaching change in the way America has done things that has been made in 50 years. We ought to be very profoundly concerned about it.

I can understand full well how people may vote for the measure with a deep feeling of concern and feel that they have got to do it for the sake of national defense in the immediate future, but I cannot understand how people can gloss the matter over and say, "Oh, well, we may as well do this, it is going to be all right there is nothing to worry about," because I believe there are lots of things to worry about, and it is about those things that I wish to say just a few words. It is true all of us want to make America proof against danger from without; we want to make her so strong that no one will dare attack her. But is it too much to ask that we at least try our very best to accomplish this in such fashion as to leave our democratic structure of government still standing?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will yield once more and then I would like to be allowed to go ahead.

Mr. RICH. What does the gentleman think about the proposition of giving an opportunity for 6 months to the people of this country to join our Army for a term of 1 year, and 1 year only, and be paid \$35 or \$40 a month? What does the gentleman think would be the outcome with respect to the number of people who would make application to join our Army?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it would be a very considerable number, I will say to the gentleman. I will say further that I believe if a call for volunteers had been issued 3 months ago and if some recognition had been given to the men volunteering, the Army might well have today all the men it could effectively train.

#### THE STANDING ARMY

Now, it appears to me from what I have been able to read and study on this question that there are three problems that have to be met. The first one of those problems is the problem of a standing Army. I think I am correct that the Army itself says that they want a regular standing Army of somewhere in the neighborhood of 375,000 to 500,000 men.

I think I am correct in the assumption that these men cannot be trained for that Army adequately in 1 year; that they have got to be people who volunteer and are ready to serve for a good deal longer than that, or for at least 3 years. I think I am correct in stating that these men should be the most highly trained and expert people in the use of modern equipment of war and should have that equipment available to them. And may I say that this is the basic importance of the so-called draft-industry amendment, and that for my part I think this bill ought never to be passed, certainly, unless that amendment is in it. We can never justify a position of saying the emergency is so great that we must draft men but not great enough to require that we

make absolutely certain that these men can be supplied with the absolutely essential materials and weapons—and at a fair price without profiteering.

But here is the first problem, the problem of the standing Army. It has got to be met by the enlistment of people who are in there for a sufficient length of time to become experts at their jobs. I think it is true that the people of the United States have never accorded to their Army the amount of respect it is due. I do not believe we have insisted upon the standards that should have prevailed in that Army. I do not believe the Army has had the pay scale it should have had. For my part, from a layman's standpoint, it seems to me that when an enlisted man goes into the Army he ought to be able to hope at some time before he dies to become at least a second lieutenant. At any rate, I think there should be some opportunity for advancement. I think the opportunity for specialized training ought to be better than it is. I do not blame the Army for these things.

I think it is largely the fault of all of us that these things are so. I think they should be corrected and I think that is the answer to the problem of the standing Army.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TERRY. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that a great many of the best officers we have in the Army now came from the ranks and they do have an opportunity of coming up from the ranks.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is that true? I have been informed that it was impossible for an enlisted man to ever become an officer in the Army.

Mr. TERRY. Oh, the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to have somebody stand up and tell me where I am wrong.

Mr. FADDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. Neither the present Chief of Staff nor the commander of the Panama Canal is a graduate of the Military Academy. A great many of the high ranking officers came from the ranks.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Well, where does this opinion come from, then? I have read it and I have heard it all my life.

Mr. FADDIS. I do not know. I cannot explain the existence of rumors at any time.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Those men came in through a war. Had those men served in peacetimes, and had we not had a war, none of the men to whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred would hold the commissions which they now hold.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I just wanted to read the gentleman, on line 10, page 18, of the present bill—

Men in training and service shall have an opportunity to qualify for promotion.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does that mean they can qualify for promotion to become commissioned officers? If so, I am very glad.

Mr. PACE. Unquestionably.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to go ahead. All I am doing is letting other people take my time. I have some things I want to say. I want to state some propositions, and I want someone to knock them down if they are wrong.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I wanted to get the gentleman's opinion about a proposition.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Well, if the gentlewoman puts it that way, I will yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I know the gentleman always tries to be fair. I would like to ask him as a matter of fairness if he thinks it is right to force men to work at a pay

that is not the market price when at the same time you are paying men in industry the market price for their products?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; I do not think it is fair. As a matter of fact, I think a comparable situation would be this: If you are asking men to come down from, say, \$120 a month to \$30 a month, it ought to be exactly as logical to ask a corporation to come down from 8-percent profit to 2 percent. [Applause.]

#### THE PRESENT EMERGENCY

The second problem we have got is the problem of meeting the present emergency. I do not know all about that present emergency. The picture that is painted for us is that if Hitler gets control of the British Fleet we will be in a different position than America has ever been in before. Of course we would. There is no question about that. Then people go on and say, "Suppose Japan and Germany both at once attack the United States or have an expeditionary force into the Western Hemisphere." It looks to me like an awfully big order.

It looks to me like it is, at best, a 50-to-1 chance that this emergency is going to take place, but I do not know for certain; and as long as I do not know for certain, I am not going to do anything that I believe is running a serious risk for the defense of the United States. But it appears to me that, if we are trying to meet an emergency in the next 6 months or so, the bill ought to be drawn with that idea in view, and I do not think it is. I believe what we are asked to vote on in this bill—and I have studied it as carefully as I could—we are asked to vote on the adoption of compulsory selective military training and service as a permanent policy for the United States of America and to do it under the impulsion of an "emergency."

Believe me, gentlemen, it is going to be difficult to ever repeal such a measure once you get it established, for you will have made of your Military Establishment one of the greatest economic factors in your whole country. You will have vested the greatest power in the Executive and the Army that Congress has ever granted in all American history, the power to draft her men into military service whether or not the Nation is at war. If you have to do it, all right; but I want to know whether you have to do it, and I want to know whether you have to do it this way. I want to know whether there is not a better way, safer for democracy, and I want us to recognize the dangers in this way and to adopt it, if we must adopt it at all for the shortest possible space of time. Remember, I am not talking here about training or discipline or anything like that. I am talking about power—concentrated Executive power over the life of American men.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman understands that the provisions of the bill are inoperative after 1945.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand that; but it certainly seems to me, in view of the present circumstances, that if you pass a bill to operate until 1945, you might just as well make it 1965. [Applause.] In other words, the operation of this bill will be clear through the next Presidential administration and into the one after that. The powers that this bill confers upon the Army and the President of the United States, whoever he may be, will last that long, and by that time they will be mighty firmly entrenched with whole sections of Government and of industry dependent on their continuance. And may I point out that the bill itself contains in section 10 a provision which without much stretching can be interpreted to make criticism of this bill—or this law, if it becomes such—a criminal act. I know that is not the intention, and I know there must be a provision to prevent "fifth column" organizations from trying to interfere with the operation of this law, if it is passed. But given just a little more of the spirit of intolerance with democratic procedure and the exercise of democratic rights than we have now, and such an interpretation as I have suggested would be quite possible. These are things to ponder.

I do not know of a nation that has adopted peacetime conscription and then repealed it. But I do know of nations which have found that conscription was by no means the answer to their problem of national defense. And I shall never forget the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], in which he called for 25 mechanized divisions of 9,000 men each and warned that we might never get them if we put our whole reliance upon numbers. Did not the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] put his finger on our very most important defense need from an army standpoint?

I have no objection to the registration of all of us, including, of course, Members of Congress. Furthermore, on the bare chance that those who prophesy immediate danger might be right. I would be ready to get up here and speak for an emergency draft of such number of men as could really be given training provided it was going to last maybe for 1 year or as long as was absolutely necessary to tide us over this time when some people are telling us that an attack on the Americas is just a matter of a few months. I might say that so far as I am concerned, this whole calculation is on the basis of defense and not of a foreign adventure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

#### TRAINING AND SERVICE TO THE NATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much. The third problem is the problem of the training of our citizenry. I hope nobody is going to give me any credit for getting up here and speaking critically of this bill or for voting against it, as I may do, on the ground of saving somebody some trouble—I am not trying to save anybody from performing a necessary service to their country. But I am trying to see that it is passed around to all equally and that the sacrifice is not concentrated in a few spots among our people.

I agree to the idea that Americans as a group of people need to learn more about what they should give to their Nation, and that we have taken too many things for granted—all of us I mean, not just young people, everybody has taken too many things for granted about our country and has not thought enough about what we needed to give to it. But on this matter it seems to me again that the bill falls short. What it is going to do is to pick out certain people and put them under the Army for a period of "training and service," as the bill puts it. We are told that is more democratic, but I am not sure, for you select certain people to do a tough job for the rest of the people. And if I read the testimony correctly these will be mostly selected from among the unemployed who have had the very least opportunity of anyone in the past few years. It seems to me that what would be a democratic proposition would be if we said that everybody in a certain age group should give a year of service to the United States of America and in so doing we gave a certain amount of choice as to the kind of service they should give and some consideration to their own abilities and opportunity for development. We should require it of all—this year of service—and those who preferred would go into the Army—and I would pay them more than the rest—and some would be doing work like the C. C. C. and some learning mechanical training, some learning aviation, some in the Coast Guard, some in public-health work, and so on; but everybody would have to do something.

I believe the Army would get enough men to have the necessary trained reserve and all these men would have an experience at some sort of orderly, health-building service to their country. But you would not be doing the one thing that I am afraid of, and that is you would not be adopting what I do not think anyone can deny is the central feature of European dictatorship. Adoption of the power to draft men as a permanent policy seems to me to be the central feature of these dictatorships. I want to use it as sparingly as possible—for an emergency, maybe; but as a permanent policy I am dead against it. I shall ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks the text of a bill I have

drafted which embraces the program I have spoken about, and which I consider as an intelligent approach to this problem, one that has some consideration for the people affected, one that takes into account the capabilities of the men, and one that gives a reasonable freedom of choice as to type of service but which requires training and service from all at some time in their lives and which would offer special inducements to those going into the armed forces. Such a program would provide a balanced program of defense training in all its aspects. I believe the schools and colleges could and should be properly tied into such a program.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I agree very heartily with the gentleman in his statement that we all owe a certain service to our country. Does not the gentleman believe that 1 year's training during which the man is paid for his time—though a small sum—and during which time he gets physical culture and other training, is not a burden particularly but rather a good and that it will not injure any young man to have a year's military training?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think I have said it would, nor do I think so, and if I am understood as criticizing the idea of training for people I am misunderstood, because that is not what I am talking about. I simply believe that when we begin to concentrate this great power and to rely on compulsion instead of the traditional method of appeal to our people for patriotic service we have lost something very important.

I think it is inevitable that the point of view of any military establishment toward life is essentially undemocratic. Perhaps that is necessary, and I do not blame the Army for thinking it would be a good idea to put a large part of the Nation under the same sort of discipline the Army itself practices. But I think the dangers in this course of action, so far as the preservation of freedom is concerned, should be very apparent. When military rank and caste become a dominant factor in any nation's life, some other things are bound to be lost out of that life. I do believe that it is the duty of the United States Congress to think of our democratic institutions now more than ever. We want a trained army, yes, and we should treat it with decent respect, as we have not done. But we want the Army to be an agency of our democracy and not its master, just as with any other agency of the Government. We want them to do the best job they can, but we do not want them to get to be the whole works; and it is my fear that if you adopt this bill as presently worded you will run into serious dangers of doing just that. I have the utmost respect for the soldier. I have the utmost respect for the present Chief of Staff of the Army, but I do not know that he will always be Chief of Staff, and I have a wholesome fear of what this bill might lead to in other hands. The whole effect of my argument is that I believe we can supply all the things needed for military defense without the dangers inherent in a permanent policy of conscription.

Under certain circumstances I am willing to take a chance on some measures, even if they seem to me dangerous to the institutions of America. I am willing to do that only if I must for national defense; and, as I said before, I want any such measure surrounded with as many safeguards as you can possibly put around it, and I want it to last only as long as absolutely necessary. It does not seem to me that we have such safeguards in this bill.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Is not one of the gentleman's objections to the bill the fact that they will come along and exempt, for instance, the fellow working in the munitions plant or the airplane plant, men drawing from \$8 to \$15 a day, but at the same time another man will be put into Army service and made to work for \$20 a month; yet the United States Government pays them both out of the same pocketbook?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Under this proposal that I sketched very briefly that could not happen, I may say to the gentleman, and at the same time the program I outlined would be administered by a civilian group. It would be a national-service program in the true sense. It seems to me we could meet the national emergency other than by a draft bill, such as this one is at present. We could make it a real emergency measure, if there is a real emergency. We could do the fair thing by the men in the standing Army; and we could have a national-service program of benefit to the Nation and to those participating in it. We could do all this without the things I fear in this bill. But I think we should be very careful, in our approach to this problem, that we do not establish such a peacetime draft as a permanent policy for the United States. [Applause.]

There follows the text of the bill (H. R. 10430) to which I have made reference in my speech:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Congress hereby declares that the defense of the United States and the preservation of its integrity and its institutions demands the broadening of the opportunities for constructive work and training for American youth, the upbuilding of the Nation's health, the conservation of human and natural resources, and the continual maintenance of a body of citizens trained for participation in all the branches of defense activity, including that of the armed forces.

Sec. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy and purpose of the Congress to establish the general principle that all male citizens of the United States shall engage in some form of service to the Nation for a period of 12 months at some time during their lives.

Sec. 3. It is further declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize the particular abilities and characteristics of individual citizens, to enable them insofar as possible to perform the service and acquire the training for which they are best fitted, and to promote the full employment of American youth in work beneficial to the Nation, its agriculture and industry, and to themselves.

Sec. 4. (a) All male citizens, and all male aliens residing in the United States or its possessions, who are between the ages of 18 and 24, shall, on the day or days fixed by the President of the United States for such registration, present themselves for registration and shall register at such times and places and in such manner as shall be determined by regulations prescribed pursuant to this act.

(b) All other male citizens, and all other male aliens residing in the United States or its possessions may voluntarily register in like manner on any day fixed by the President for such registration.

Sec. 5. Commencing with the calendar year 1941, all male citizens and all male aliens residing in the United States and its possessions reaching their eighteenth birthday during the preceding calendar year, or having reached their eighteenth birthday subsequent to the registration listed under section 2 of this act, shall, on the day or days fixed by the President of the United States for such registration, present themselves for registration and shall register at such times and at such places and in such manner as shall be determined by regulations prescribed pursuant to this act.

Sec. 6. (a) All persons who shall register under the terms of section 2 or 3 of this act shall be available to be called to perform service to the Nation for a period of 12 months under the agencies designated as national service agencies in section 13 of this act.

(b) At the time of registration each registrant shall indicate a first, second, and third preference as to the type of service he desires to perform and shall also indicate the year during which he desires to perform such service: *Provided*, That such service shall be performed during some year between the ages of 18 and 24 for each registrant required to register under this act.

Sec. 7. (a) The President shall be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint a commission of not less than 7 and not more than 15 qualified citizens, to be known as the American National Service Commission (hereinafter called the "Commission"), which Commission shall have the authority to select, so far as possible in accordance with their first preference, and during the year of their choice, such registrants as the various national service agencies shall certify that they can constructively employ during the ensuing year.

(b) The Commission shall appoint such national-service boards in the States and localities of the Nation as may be necessary to assist it in carrying out its duties as set forth in this act. Such national-service boards shall include representatives of religious, educational, labor, agricultural, industrial, and youth organizations.

Sec. 8. All persons who are found to be opposed on grounds of religious or conscientious conviction to the performance of military service shall be completely exempted from any such service under this act.

Sec. 9. The Commission shall, in consultation with the heads of the various national-service agencies, determine quota limits for each agency and shall have authority to select from among those requesting service in any agency, such numbers as that agency shall certify can be constructively employed by it during the fiscal year from the date of their selection, and to assign them to such agency.

Sec. 10. Men during their period of service shall receive \$25 per month, plus necessary travel expenses from their home to the point of assignment, together with maintenance during the period of

their service: *Provided, however*, That men choosing assignment to any branch of the armed forces of the United States and assigned to such service shall receive \$30 per month.

Sec. 11. The President is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to establish the method of registration provided for under section 2 and section 3 of this act; and such regulations shall provide for a method of registering the preferences as to the type of service of each person so registered, together with a method of listing the year during which each registrant may desire to serve: *Provided*, That such service shall be performed between the eighteenth and twenty-fourth year of each registrant. The President is authorized and directed to establish regulations for the physical examination of all persons so registered, with proper provisions to assure that registrants will not be permitted to serve in any agency in which the service would injure their health; and to further provide a system of educational examination boards, to assure that persons selecting service under any agency requiring technical or educational training for effective service, have such technical or educational training as will make the service of such persons of value to the Nation. In the case of persons engaged in courses of study, training courses, or work of a nature essential to the national defense or the welfare of the Nation, the Commission, through the local national-service boards shall have power to designate such study, training, or work as national service and to exempt such persons from other such service.

Sec. 12. The Commission is hereby authorized to establish, under the active control of a civilian agency having experience in the field, and after proper negotiations with and approval by representatives of the nations involved, service camps in any or all South or Central American nations where such camps might aid in the national policy of friendship and good will to neighboring nations. All persons registered would be eligible for such service: *Provided*, That the Commission carefully investigated the individuals requesting such service to make certain that only those registrants who could aid in the national policy of good will to neighboring nations were assigned to such service.

Sec. 13. The following agencies are hereby designated as national service agencies:

1. Civilian Conservation Corps.
2. Civil Aeronautics Authority.
3. National Youth Administration.
4. Public Health Service.
5. Soil Conservation Service.
6. United States Army.
7. United States Army Corps of Engineers.
8. United States Coast Guard.
9. United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.
10. United States Forest Service.
11. United States Marine Corps.
12. United States Navy.

Congress shall from time to time add to the above list of national-service agencies the names of such other agencies as in the opinion of the Commission should be designated as national-service agencies.

Sec. 14. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if there is any one Member who has been an ardent supporter of most of the New Deal legislation, it is the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] who just left the floor. His conscience seems to be bothering him a little bit and he seems to be worrying about what is going to happen if this conscription bill is passed. He is not alone in that worry, but coming, as it does, from one who has given his allegiance all through our sessions to practically everything that has been sent up by the White House, it ought to make the rest of us think a little. The gentleman seems to be much concerned about who is going to train these men. Well, the President has appointed Sidney Hillman to take care of some of the youth of the land and we cannot tell from what the President has said what kind of training they are going to have, nor who is going to train them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I simply want to make an observation with regard to the so-called labor leaders who have come out for this conscription idea. If they would pay more attention to labor's unfair list and less attention to the calling list at the White House, they would be rendering a real loyal service to American labor. [Applause.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Quite true, and for once I find the C. I. O. opposing a measure which I oppose. Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make, and I hope the gentleman is listening,

is this: You can never tell by what the President says what he is going to do. In support of that statement let me call your attention to the utterances of three of his friends within the last 30 days. After the President made that statement through Senator BARKLEY at the Chicago convention that he did not want to be President of the United States, and did not want to be a candidate, do you remember that David Lawrence, in an issue of the United States News in almost so many words, said that the President was not telling the truth? Do you remember that Hugh Johnson said that that statement was not the truth? Do you remember that Raymond Clapper said that it was a historical and monumental deception? So some of us now are wondering whether this conscription bill is a bill to get men in order that they may be trained, or a bill to get men to carry on a war. It ought to be self-evident, because Americans are patriotic, that if the people believed this country were in danger of invasion, if they believed that our national safety were in peril, you would find men all over the country, yes, even Members of the House here, men physically unfit, volunteering for national defense. The reason you have not had more volunteers is because so few have any confidence in the man in the White House. Is that not right? That is the reason you have not had more volunteers, and that is one of the reasons why you have opposition to this bill.

Ever since the time he began to see submarines off the coast he has been pulling one thing after another on the people to frighten them.

Let us consider this message that came up here today. Who owns the warships? Who owns these destroyers? Does the President own them? Are they his warships? Some might think and some unthinking people might believe, from the way he has used them for vacation trips, that he owns them, but he does not. At least there is no law that has given him title to them. Yet what does he do? Although Congress is in session, although he knows that he can get any reasonable legislation he asks for the purpose of national defense through this House inside of a week, out of a clear sky he makes a deal for these destroyers. That is bad enough, but he gets skinned when he makes the deal.

What did he do? He trades off a bunch of destroyers for a leasehold. What does that mean? We are going to spend millions, perhaps billions, of dollars, to build airports, naval stations, and military bases on these bases. We are going to spend an enormous sum of money fortifying those places, and at the end of 99 years they go back to Great Britain. What kind of a deal is that? There is no horse trading about that which is profitable to us, is there?

There is a further thought that comes to my mind. Let us assume that it is necessary for national defense that the United States obtain offshore air, naval, and military bases so as to make impregnable our coast line. I am in favor of acquiring all we need. That necessity does not justify President Roosevelt assuming the powers of a dictator. But there is an honest, legal way to get them. There is a fair way to get them. There is an American way to get them, and that is through the people's representatives. Let us get them that way.

Great Britain and France both owe us stupendous sums. France has been overthrown. Great Britain is in great danger. No one would take advantage of that danger to drive a hard bargain. But, remembering that, after the last war, she characterized us as a Shylock, there is no reason why we should not compel her now to deal fairly and honestly with us.

The President has transferred 50 of our cruisers to Great Britain in exchange for certain leaseholds on which to build defense works. Does he propose to send these destroyers into the war zone with American crews? How long ago was it that he promised to keep us out of war? Is this another one of his many recklessly made, quickly violated promises?

Send these destroyers across the seas with American crews and the United States is in the war, and it is in the war through the treachery of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Personally I cannot reconcile the Attorney General's opinion with the principles of democracy as I have always understood them. If we carry the Attorney General's opinion through to its logical conclusion, I understand the President is authorized to sell the whole Navy, if he wants to. That to me seems perfectly ridiculous. If he has authority to sell any part of the Navy, of course he has the authority to sell the whole Navy. That is the most undemocratic thing I can ever imagine.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why ask me a legal question about what the President can or should do? Has the President ever paid any attention to law? Does he regard it and obey it? The day has gone by when we in Congress should waste very much time while this man is in the White House. Talking about what is legal or constitutional? He is a law unto himself. His own opinion is the only law he recognizes. As the gentleman intimates, the President is not the owner of either the Army, the Navy, or any one of these United States or any city or subdivision of it. He talks and acts as though he had absolute power, not only over our destiny but over the physical property of these United States.

If he has authority to bargain with Great Britain and to either give or trade to her a part of the Navy, then it follows, does it not, that he has authority to trade her all of it—to transfer a part of the Army or the Army's equipment, our airplanes, our cannon? If he can give away or sell the Nation's property, then by the same authority he can transfer a part of our territory—for example, the city of New York—because, forsooth, Great Britain's Navy will be able better to defend New York's harbors. If he can bargain for a base in Newfoundland, then by the same authority he can bargain and acquire a base on the English Channel.

Not only does he act without authority, in violation of international law, but he makes a bad bargain. Why accept a lease of British soil? Why, on leased bases, build defense works at an expense of millions or billions of dollars and then, at the end of the lease period, let Great Britain have back her land with all the bases, the forts, the airports, the harbors we have built?

In truth, the acquirement of these bases is an effort to involve us in the war and to aid England—not a move for national defense.

The President would sell to them our destroyers and, if he sends them across the seas with American crews, he should be impeached. But perhaps the destroyers are already in the English Channel.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman agree that it is entirely possible, and it is a fact, that the sale of the destroyers to England may strengthen the United States' defense?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If it is true that it will strengthen the defense of the United States, if we absolutely must have it, is there not a legal way? Does the gentleman believe that the Congress and the Constitution should be thrown out the window just because this man in the White House had some idea in his head of taking a short, illegal cut? Does the gentleman not believe that his colleagues here in Congress have patriotism and intelligence enough to find a legal way? Can we not declare war, if we must? Do you want to sneak the American people into another world war before they know what is happening? You are not strengthening the United States' defense by disposing of 50 of her destroyers when you admit that we are inadequately prepared to defend our own shores. Sending them across 3,000 miles of ocean does not add to the defense of the American coast line.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman explain to the House how in the world it is going to strengthen the British Navy to send them 50 obsolete ships that are so battered and worn they are likely to sink in our harbors?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Obsolete, my eye. Who thinks they are obsolete?

Mr. PATRICK. I thought the gentleman said we were getting the worst of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We certainly are, when we give them 50 good destroyers in exchange for a lease and on the land leased spend billions of dollars and then, at the end of the term of the leasehold, give them the whole works. There is fraud and deception in the whole transaction. Does the President have to certify they are obsolete?

I do not know about that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Assuming that he does have to certify that they are obsolete, and that he will certify that they are obsolete, if he is a naval expert and finds on his responsibility as President, or as Chief Executive, that they are obsolete, then what good are they to the British Navy or to anybody else? How will we be helping the British Navy and how will we be helping our defense in any way by giving these ships away?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I should like to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to answer that question.

Mr. MAY. I will answer the question and be very happy to answer it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman can make anybody believe it, give us the answer to the question asked by my colleague from the Seventh Michigan District [Mr. Wolcott], who served with distinction in the World War.

Mr. MAY. The Chief of Naval Operations today, under the laws that exist now, has merely to certify under section 14 (a) of the statute that such destroyers are not essential to the national defense of the United States and that in his judgment the strategic naval bases of this country will strengthen the defense of the United States rather than weaken it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman has the answer to the question he asked me, and the substance of his answer is, that the defense of the United States—and we have authorized the expenditure of billions to build new ships, create new defenses—is strengthened by giving away 50 good destroyers which we already have afloat.

Now, to me that just does not make sense. You strengthen yourself, according to the gentleman, by giving away a part of your defensive weapons. We need destroyers. We are building new destroyers. And we improve our national defense by giving away 50 of those we already have. That may sound sensible to diplomats, but it will not go down with a hard-headed farmer, who knows that he cannot get more milk by giving away a part of his herd of milk cows.

And, if you are preparing for national defense, are you preparing for national defense here in America, or are you trying to involve us in the war across the seas? Now, tell me that.

Mr. MAY. I will be glad to say to the gentleman that the only thing we are doing is preparing for the defense of this country, and a great many of us believe that if England is conquered we will have a job on our own hands that will be much more difficult than the one we have now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Assume that is true. Then your argument is that though we now lack an adequate defense we send a part of it into the war. To use a homely expression, well understood, why send a boy to mill? The logic of your argument is that to defend ourselves we must win the war for England. We did that once. Are you intent on doing it again? Are you sending 50 destroyers to England under American officers and crews so as to make our involvement certain? If that be the purpose, then be honest with our people and declare war. For myself, I want none of it. My country is America. Not just part of the time—all of the time, and with my whole heart and soul. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Patrick].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, really a man cannot get after what ought to be discussed here in 10 minutes, but it

is growing late, so I do not suppose anybody is going to be aggrieved because there is not longer time given for discussion.

One of the most significant things I have heard from those who oppose this measure—and I want to say at the outset that I am supporting it with all the strength I have; I have not had any more feeling of confidence in any bill since I have been in this House—is that they discuss the fact that there are nations that are at war now that had no conscription, such as Canada, which has only recently had a very light touch of it.

It seems to me that any study of how totalitarianism asserts itself in the world, and the way the dictator treads on the face of the earth would show that we are not dealing with the niceties of mankind today. If they had had conscription and proper training in Canada, in Holland, in Belgium, and in France—

Mr. BENDER. They did have it in France.

Mr. PATRICK. If they had had it in the measure they should have had, and had also gone on and equipped themselves with matériel and given proper training, the condition of the earth would not have been so that the small man would have been in the saddle of totalitarianism and making the earth quake today.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. No; not for the present. I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is enough.

Mr. PATRICK. I cannot yield my time to the gentleman. It would not be fair to the people of the United States for me to yield my time to the gentleman, my time for his. It would not be a fair exchange.

I think the President, incidentally, got a great bargain, because at least that lease is for 99 years, and these obsolete warships cannot last quite that long.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I cannot yield for a question. The gentleman is liable to ask me the wrong question.

I believe if there is anything that illustrates that a stitch in time saves nine it is this sort of thing. What manner of reasoning is going on? Why, preparedness of this nature is a twofold thing. We hope to prepare, knowing the position that one has to take in this world where might means right. Here is the twofold idea. In the first place, we want to guarantee peace, if it can be guaranteed, and failing in that, to guarantee victory. That is the end of the program now. Do you remember the old, old story of the fellow driving down the road? Everybody has heard it.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order. If the gentleman makes any more mistakes I want to hear them.

Mr. PATRICK. If you listen for all my mistakes, brother, you will be busy, and if there is anybody in the House that ought to be able to sympathize with the gentleman from Alabama on that score, you should. [Laughter.]

You remember he was going down the road driving a team of oxen, and he popped a lizard here, and he popped a grasshopper there. Finally he came to a hornets' nest suspended from a tree, and the little boy with him said, "Why don't you get after them babies?" The man said, "Them babies is organized." [Laughter.] Here we go today, 100,000 men behind our authorized manpower in training. We should say to the mothers here: "There is no better way to guarantee the safety of your sons than to prepare and equip them to defend themselves." There are two good reasons. One, it makes their having to defend themselves less likely and places them in safer positions if they do have to defend themselves. This is not preparedness for war but for peace.

Some of our boys are growing soft and flabby, too. Only 32 percent of those examined for military duty make the grade.

It looks to me that anybody who has studied this question would realize that America is preparing against one thing, and one thing only—totalitarian spread. I met the weeping mothers—I think they call themselves that—or they met me in the hall this noon and they asked me how I stood, and I told them, and they said that they believed in preparedness, and I asked them how many sons they had in the Army now that had enlisted, and not a one answered up; not a one. They do not want their boys in it, I fear, not even peacetime preparedness. Do you recall the old song, I Did Not Raise My Boy To Be a Soldier?

I want to tell you something: There is no sacrifice too great to be made for your country, for the United States of America, to prepare itself so that it can maintain peace; so that no power that treads the earth dare assail this country here.

That is the only safety and security on the face of this earth today, the only one that exists in this day and time, and therefore if we are going to have peace, there is just one way to have it and that is to be big enough so that nobody is going to climb onto us. It is a simple proposition but it has got down to that cold-blooded fact.

This is not preparing for war—this is preparing for peace; and if there is any way under high heaven to guarantee peace this will do it, and if we cannot get peace by these means, we cannot guarantee it in any other way. This Nation is the richest prize on the face of the earth. The totalitarian in Europe has long dreamed of world power. He is living in the shadow of the history of Alexander and Hannibal and Caesar and Napoleon and whenever he casts his eyes across the water he sees that if he can get all the navies of the Eastern Hemisphere under his power then there is nothing under heaven to keep him from crossing over to make conquest upon this fair and happy land here. It has the harbors; it has the fields, mineral deposits, the industrious people; it has the riches; it has everything.

It is a "have" nation, and that 82,000,000 people they call Germany is a "have not" nation. It has to depend on what it can get hold of from other sources to guarantee its destiny that Hitler talks so much about.

Do you remember that in one of the marching songs that the Germans march to today—

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will my good friend yield for just an observation?

Mr. PATRICK. No; I just cannot do it.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not going to ask a question; I just want to make an observation.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman is interrupting, and I know all he has to offer; and he is about to interrupt here at an excellent place where the country could not afford to miss it. [Laughter.]

In the Hitler marching song there is a line that runs like this: "Today we own Germany, tomorrow the whole world."

Hitler has already pronounced the benediction on America and its form of government and he is just waiting for the time when he can march in. Why, he has already declared against our Monroe Doctrine, has already thrown it out of his window. He has declared our form of government outmoded and unworkable. What are we waiting for? If we are going to prepare, if we are going to keep out of war, how are we going to do it? Is there anything more democratic than to have all ante up? Every State alike. It is a funny thing to see the gentleman from New York coming in here in opposition and New York with twice the population of Texas. For example, for the last 6 months—and I have just got the figures—Texas has had more volunteers than New York. The New Yorkers are quite as patriotic as the Texans; all they want is for Uncle Sam to make it definite.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I will have to yield now to the gentleman.

Mr. McDOWELL. I saw just about 2 weeks ago a statement showing what the average weekly wage down there—

Mr. PATRICK. I thought you were going to ask me a question. I refuse to yield any further, because he is going to make a speech in my time. Do not they let you have any time over there, Big Boy?

The facts are that if we are going to get our program organized the thing to do is to start in time and not be standing up here and doing the very thing for which we criticized France and other nations when they failed to prepare. America asks what Congress is waiting for, with our Army 105,000 behind its own mark. We talk of training and preparing on one score; they jump on that, and they say we ought to wait until we get all the guns and everything before we put the boys in. You do not have to have a gun that will shoot in peacetime. Stuff can be passed along.

Now, to get back to the other figure, and I will come to that in a minute if time serves me, that is the democratic feature of this plan. Under the volunteer system today Kentucky and North Carolina lead all the rest of the country. My State stands very high. Now, what is more democratic than having each State do its proportion, and I do not care who you are. What is the difference whether you are rich or poor, what kind of job you have, whose son you are or how much you are making; every mother's son in America ought to be willing to stand forth and go and contribute his part to preparing so that this Nation may have its safety and security under heaven to handle the material when it does come on through.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PAGE. I am not a Tarheel, but North Carolina is No. 1 and Kentucky is No. 2.

Mr. PATRICK. That is right, but for the first 6 months of this year Kentucky led North Carolina. Anyhow, they are so close together there is no great measurable difference.

We want an army of 1,200,000 trained men by next spring. We ought to have them already, but have not. We want 400,000 more in this fall and 400,000 in addition next spring. Can we get them by volunteer enlistment? You know very well we cannot.

The fit survive in this rocky old world. Let the weak wail their wishing song. We are a free people but a strong people. We shall keep fit, individually and nationally, that we may survive.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I thank my friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] for the high compliment he paid Kentucky and Kentuckians, wherein he said Kentucky for the first 6 months of this year led all the States in the Union in the number of volunteers for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, according to her population.

Kentuckians are a patriotic people. I represent a district of patriotic, loyal Americans. The people of my district have always loved the Union, and were bitterly opposed to human slavery. In many of the counties, more men and boys volunteered for the Union Army to uphold the Union and abolish slavery than there were legal voters in those counties.

We have before us this measure that proposes to conscript the boys and men of this Nation, ranging from 21 years to 45 years, approximately 25,000,000. No one could believe more strongly in adequate preparedness for the defense of our Nation than I. We should be prepared on land and sea and in the air. I have voted for all appropriations and authorizations to provide us a two-ocean navy in the Atlantic and the Pacific, with ample ships, submarines, and aircraft; and for ample tanks, guns, planes, and other supplies and quarters for our Army and Marine Corps so that we may be equipped to defend this country against any and all nations that may assail us. I have so expressed myself many times on the floor of this House—that I favored billions for defense, but not one dollar for conquest, aggression, or meddling in the wars of Europe, Asia, or Africa.

I first became a Member of this House on March 4, 1919. During my years of service here and in the Senate I have been called upon to vote on many important questions. When the roll was called I never dodged by voting "present." I always voted "yes" or "no," as appeared to me to be right. [Applause.] I consider this conscription bill before us the

most important and far-reaching in its consequences of any bill that I have ever been called to pass upon.

We must have men to man our ships and submarines, operate our guns, and fly our planes in defense of our country. If there is no reasonable way to provide these men except by conscription, then in that event I would favor conscription. This is a tremendously important step. We are forsaking the American tradition, the American way of providing manpower for our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps with volunteers in peacetime. We propose in this bill to adopt the policy of all the dictators of the earth for the last 50 centuries. We are forsaking democracy and embracing militarism. This Nation has resorted to the draft and conscription only in time of war. If we foresake the American way, the way of democracy, in peacetime, there should be compelling reasons for taking such action. We should not take this step except in war or unless our Nation is in imminent peril, and we cannot secure the manpower for our defense. If war is imminent, why does not the President say to the country where and when war threatens, and why does not the President and the Congress have the courage to base this conscription on a real threat of war?

Ever since England and France declared war against Germany, this Nation has been filled with war propaganda. The President and others of his political family have gone up and down the land filling the people with fear and war hysteria. Those who would profit by these war alarms and the entry of our country into war and all European propagandists have been insisting on our conscripting the manpower of this country. The President was elected in what he terms was an emergency. He has been creating many emergencies each and every year since he assumed office. He is seeking a third term. He must make the American people believe he is the indispensable man. It takes a great emergency to make the indispensable man necessary.

Not one well-informed person believes for a minute that Hitler and Mussolini, even though they should defeat England, would do the foolish thing of embarking upon an expedition against the United States or the Western Hemisphere. The 22 miles of the English Channel halted Hitler—what about the more than 3,000 miles of Atlantic Ocean between Hitler and the United States and the Western Hemisphere? What would the tens and tens of millions of enemies of Hitler in Europe do to him while he was engaged in an expedition of that great magnitude and great expense? No great nation can travel 3,000 miles and successfully attack another great nation. It cannot be done.

If Hitler desired more territory after he defeated Great Britain, he certainly would direct his efforts to the Balkans to the south and southwest of Europe, countries adjacent to the German Empire. Why would he do the uncertain and foolish thing of attacking the United States and the other 20 Central American and South American countries? I cannot believe that we are in danger of an attack from Hitler or Mussolini.

But let us assume that we are. Is conscription necessary to meet the requirements for the defense of our country?

EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND READY TO BE CALLED

The important units for the defense of our country on the coast are our ships, planes, submarines, coast-defense guns, and anti-aircraft guns. The important thing for our land defenses is a mechanized army, with tanks, airplanes, and anti-aircraft guns, and supplies and quarters for our men. The President now has at his disposal 800,000 men of the Regular Army, the Marine Corps, the National Guard, and the Reserves. He could call all 800,000 of these men into the service now. Of the 400,000 men of the National Guard, he has called less than 60,000. It is agreed that we do not have equipment and quarters complete for as many as 150,000 men.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the additional million were called to the colors under this legislation, would it not place a considerable strain on our supply of broomsticks? [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Well, we might have a harder time furnishing stovepipes than broomsticks. [Laughter.]

Mr. Knudsen, the great industrialist who has been put on the President's National Defense Council, and who perhaps knows more about the development of our defense program than any other man, stated that with all the money that Congress had appropriated and every available factory and instrumentality used at full speed, we would not have the equipment for an army of 750,000 men before 1942. That being true, why should we now pass this bill and put 25,000,000 men under the draft and conscript a million men within the next few months at an expense of an additional one and a half billion dollars yearly to the taxpayers of the country when we have an empty Treasury and with the direct and indirect debts and obligations of the National Government now more than \$50,000,000,000? This simply does not make sense.

We do not have the equipment nor the barracks and quarters to accommodate a third of the men who are already available and could be called out by the President immediately. Do we propose to call this million more men into the service and put them in tents next winter and have another great outbreak of influenza and other epidemics of diseases as we had during the World War?

And do we propose to use these men in foreign countries? They certainly are not necessary for the defense of our own country, and many of us are afraid that this whole scheme is to further involve us in the European-Asiatic-African war.

How many men do we really need? Maj. Gen. James K. Parsons, commander of the Third Corps Area, in a speech on August 2 told the Nation that he was against "ungainly numbers" in the Army, and that 500,000 men were as many as the Nation needed or could train carefully. General Parsons did say, "If we are going to stretch"—and I think it is a long stretch—"the Monroe Doctrine to include Singapore and Shanghai, China, and South America, we will need an Army of millions; if we are going to defend our own Nation, a relatively small but well-trained force will be more than adequate." General Marshall, Chief of Staff, stated to one of the committees in Congress that a well-trained and well-equipped Army of about 585,000 men would be all that is necessary to defend the United States, and such an Army, with our Navy and air force, could protect this country against the combined attacks of the armies and navies of any and all the belligerent nations.

The American people might as well get their eyes open—these militarists and warmongers are not thinking in terms of merely defending the United States and the Western Hemisphere; they are thinking in terms of millions of men, and hence this bill before us brings within its provisions about 25,000,000 men. Let us not overlook the fact that a standing Army of a million men will mean about one and a half to \$2,000,000,000 annually for its maintenance and upkeep.

GIVE THE VOLUNTEER SYSTEM A REAL TEST

As the President now has 800,000 men subject to his call with equipment and quarters for less than 150,000, and we have 200,000 or more men in the Navy, let us try the American way, the way of democracy, to secure such other men as we may need and as we need them.

I agree with ex-Secretary of War Woodring, who said in a recent statement that the volunteer system had never been given a fair test. He expressed the opinion that he tried to have the Army adopt the policy to give the volunteer system a real test, but he had been thwarted in his efforts. He points out that if the period of enlistment should be reduced from 3 years to 1 year and the pay increased from \$21 to \$30 per month, all the volunteers needed could be obtained. The fact about it is the Army and Navy do not favor the volunteer system. They prefer a pool of 25,000,000 men from which they could draw at any time and without any effort all the men that they might desire or need, and then it would be unnecessary for them to have recruiting stations or recruiting officers. The truth is the ways of the Army and Navy are not the ways of a democracy.

Now, let us see if the volunteer system would get these men as we need them. In the month of June 23,000 men volunteered for the Army, in July 33,000 volunteered, and in

August it is estimated the number increased to 40,000, and it is confidently expected for the next several months without any change in the policies the volunteer enlistments will average 50,000 per month. Now, if this enlistment period was fixed at 1 year instead of 3 and with pay of at least \$30 a month instead of \$21 and the President would actually call for volunteers and point out to the American people why the men of this Nation are needed and would assure them that they would not be used in any wars of conquest or aggression or to meddle in the wars of Europe, Asia, or Africa, but they were being called to be trained to defend our country and even the Western Hemisphere, does any person doubt but what we would have from 600,000 to a million volunteers within the next year, when as a matter of fact according to Mr. Knudsen we will not have the equipment for an army of 750,000 until 1942.

Another reason why the Army and Navy are so strong for conscripting a million or more men is that it means thousands of promotions for the officers now in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. The Navy is getting all the recruits it needs. The Army fixed a quota for the volunteers it needed and could take care of. These quotas have been exceeded from time to time. The Air Corps has stopped taking recruits because it had more volunteers than it needed or could take care of.

One great trouble in securing volunteers is lack of faith in the President of the United States. Too many people believe that the President will involve this Nation in a foreign war, and the American boys, as a rule, and their fathers and mothers are unwilling for them to fight and die in foreign lands and on foreign seas. There are nearly 500,000 of the National Guard and Reserves that are ready and waiting for the call. You mark my words, tens of thousands of these National Guards and Reserves will not be called into the service before the spring of 1941, and we will not have equipment for them at that time. If the volunteer system is given a real chance the President can have at his disposal at least 400,000 volunteers before the 1st of next April, but with no equipment nor quarters for them.

Sticks, stovepipes, and ice-cream trucks are now being used for guns, cannons, and tanks. Our soldiers could use such equipment for years and would then be unprepared. We must have real guns and real tanks and real planes—fighting, pursuit, and bombing planes—and train our men with these real machines and instrumentalities of war. Congress will be in session. I shall be willing, and I know that is the feeling shared by an overwhelming majority of Congress, that when we have provided equipment and the volunteer system has failed we can in a very brief time adopt conscription. As this policy is not necessary at this time, I shall vote against this bill. [Applause.]

#### THE FARMERS, THE WORKERS, THE CHURCHES OPPOSE

Every farm organization, the railroad brotherhoods, the miners, and all other labor groups, the churches of our land, Catholic and Protestant, and the common people generally of this Nation oppose conscription of the manpower of this Nation in peacetime. They assert and I agree with them that this is the road that every dictator in 50 centuries has followed to autocratic power and control. Democracy means more to these groups than I have mentioned than any other groups in this country. Under dictators and totalitarian governments these groups have suffered more than any other groups. If we can conscript flesh and blood in peacetime we can conscript industry and agriculture. The bill as passed in the Senate conscripts the manpower and gives the right to conscript industry. If this can be done, then the next step can easily be taken as it has been done in countries ruled by dictators to conscript workers, the farms, and the farmers.

We all owe a duty to protect and defend our country and when the time comes and it is necessary to conscript flesh and blood I shall then be willing to conscript dollars. During the World War we conscripted flesh and blood but we let the dollars remain at home to profiteer, and we made hundreds and hundreds of multimillionaires. Wealth cannot be any more sacred than flesh and blood. In time of peril the manpower and the wealth of the Nation should be available for its defense.

For many months now the Members of the House and Senate have been bombarded by many rich men and rich women urging us to vote for conscription—conscript the men and boys of this Nation. The other day the Senate put in the conscription bill the provision to conscript wealth. Now we are covered up with resolutions, letters, and telegrams from these same rich men and women, chambers of commerce, and other business organizations insisting that it is an outrage and that this provision should be taken out of the Senate bill. Some of them have expressed opposition to the whole thing now. What right have we to conscript flesh and blood and refuse to conscript wealth? If the peril is so great that we must take the one we ought also to take the other. We are not at war; why confer upon the President or any other man dictatorial powers over either individuals or industry? The farmers and the common people know that this is a real threat to their freedom and their liberties, and this is likewise the attitude of the churches, and they therefore oppose conscription in peacetime. They insist, however, that if we conscript men that in justice to all we should conscript machines, plants, and wealth. If we conscript the men of this country we take away from them their opportunities for gain and advancement and in many cases we take away their very lives.

We have heard the strong appeals of the Army and Navy men, the strong appeals of men and women of great wealth and influence insisting that we forsake the American traditions of 150 years and pass this conscription bill to draft or conscript 25,000,000 men. We have heard from President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor; President John L. Lewis, of the C. I. O.; other labor organizations and the various railroad brotherhoods; we have heard from the farm organizations; we have heard from the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, expressing strong opposition to this bill; but we have not heard from the 25,000,000 unorganized men who come within the provisions of this bill. We have not heard from the millions of mothers and fathers whose sons are involved, except the thousands of letters that I have received from my own district urging me to oppose this un-American, undemocratic measure. These men say they are willing, and these fathers and mothers likewise say they are willing for their sons to go when this Nation is in peril and their services are needed; but they are very much opposed to being drafted or conscripted in peacetime; and more than likely in the end we will fight the wars of other nations in foreign lands and on foreign seas.

Conscription of men, industry, or agriculture is not now necessary, and my efforts and vote shall be directed to defeat this bill.

#### THE BURKE-WADSWORTH BILL

On June 20, 1940, Senator BURKE, of Nebraska, and Representative WADSWORTH, of New York, introduced companion bills in the Senate and House. These bills are known to the country as the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

It is interesting to note the evolution of this proposal. Last spring the President was quoted as favoring placing girls and women as well as boys and men in military training camps and Mr. Sidney Hillman was to be in charge. [Laughter.] The American people rose up with such great vehemence that this conscription idea died in the birthing. The next step was the Burke-Wadsworth bill. It provided for the conscription of all boys and men between the ages of 18 to 65. This included approximately 45,000,000 men. And what do you think it was proposed to pay these men called for training and service? The magnificent sum of \$5 per month. However, there was no provision to provide these 64-year-olds with crutches or canes. [Laughter.] Certain individuals, generally outside of my congressional district, urged me to support this monstrous Burke-Wadsworth bill.

After weeks of barrages of opposition by the American people, we have before us today this new bill that undertakes to conscript all men between the ages of 21 and 45, about 25,000,000 men in all.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Oh, I know the gentleman is going to say it is selective draft.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. For a moment only.

Mr. MAY. Yes. The gentleman urges the volunteer system. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill provides that the man at the end of the year's service may volunteer in the Regular Army if he wants.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; I have heard that.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] suggests that the bill gives him an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army. It permits him to avoid the penalty of serving for 10 additional years when there is 1 out of 10 men selected; provided he will enlist in the Regular Army for a period of 3 years.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am looking at this bill down through the years. This bill covers 25,000,000 men and boys. What does that mean? It means we throw a barrier across the paths of 25,000,000 boys and men in this country, and from the day this draft bill is passed and signed that barrier remains across their pathway at least until 1945, for 5 years, and if they are selected for training and service for 1 year, it remains for another 10 years unless after the 1 year of training and service they volunteer and enlist in the Regular Army or National Guard and serve for a period of 3 years.

With this barrier before them, they cannot plan their education or their business or their future. I rode to the Capitol in a taxi the other day. The driver was a young man who would come within this law, somewhere between 21 and 31. I noticed his taxi had been used a good deal. He needed a new one. He said, "I was going to get me a new taxi, but I don't know whether to get it or not."

I received a letter from another young man who wrote:

I have an opportunity to buy a filling station and go into business, but I don't know what to do about it in view of this conscription bill.

Another young man wrote: "I have an opportunity to buy a tract of land at a bargain and to marry," but, he said, "I don't know whether to do this or not."

I have many other letters along this line, indicating that if this conscription measure becomes a law their lives will be halted.

It will mean quite a lot to the economic and social life of this Nation to have this barrier of uncertainty across the pathways of 25,000,000 boys and men. The impression has gone forth that this merely provides for training. The bill in express terms says that the conscripted man will be called for training and service and inducted into the United States Army or Navy, and it provides that the President may, at any time, war or no war, or even threat of war, induct these men into the Army or Navy. That is what the bill says. We should be fair and frank about it. Now, after he has had his year of training in service as provided in this bill, is he turned loose to go and plan his future in education and other respects? No. The barrier is there for another 10 years. Under this bill, you give the President the power to make regulations, and the bill says that these shall have the force of law. These men will be subject to the dictation and control of the President.

Let us not be deceived; the demand for conscription in this country stems out of Europe. It was caught up by big business in New York. Rich men and rich women are deeply concerned about their billions of investments across the seas. While I deeply sympathize with Great Britain and other countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa, my first duty is to protect our own country and to protect the boys, men, and mothers of this Nation. You will observe that when the Senate put in the provision to draft dollars and wealth that your mail was quite different. These rich men and women lost interest in conscription. [Laughter.]

It is true that new men cannot be called under this bill after 5 years, but if this un-American, un-democratic proposal is once written into the law of this country, with the influence of a great Army and a great Navy and other in-

fluences in this country, this will become the settled policy of this Nation. It is true that totalitarian nations now have and have always had conscription in peacetime. This made them militaristic and warlike. It got them into wars about every 25 years, but it did not save them. They had systems of this kind when Germany was defeated. France and other countries have always had this conscript system, but this policy did not save France or these other nations.

#### POLITICIANS AND ALIENS EXEMPTED

This bill expressly exempts aliens. If this Nation is in imminent peril these aliens—and there are hundreds of thousands of them that are British—should be conscripted as American boys are or be required to return to Great Britain and there enlist in behalf of their own country. Why conscript the American boys to help protect Great Britain and then exempt from the draft British subjects in this country?

This bill expressly exempts Senators and Congressmen and other executive officers of the United States Government. It likewise exempts State officials and other executive officers and members of legislatures of the States, as well as judges. They cannot be called until their terms of office expire. If we can take the young men of America out of their colleges and universities, away from their businesses, farms, and their homes, why not also take the politicians?

#### NO CONSCRIPTION IN BRITISH DOMINIONS

I wonder what some of our overenthusiastic Americans will say when they learn the fact that neither Canada, Australia, New Zealand, nor other British Dominions have passed a conscription law? Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and other British Dominions are in war. They have declared war with their mother country, England, against Germany and Italy. They have more at stake than the people of the United States. Yet they have not conscripted their citizens to go to England or elsewhere to fight for their Empire. They recently passed a law in Canada calling men to train for 30 days as home guards. There is no conscription law in Canada or the other Dominions to require men to go overseas and fight even for their own British Empire.

If this bill passes, we will then have made provisions for an army of more than a million seven hundred thousand, and the President can force these American boys to fight in foreign lands, and, as some of our American people desire, to bail out Great Britain and other European, Asiatic, and African nations. These dominions are bound to be in greater danger than the United States, but they have not resorted to conscription as yet. This bill drafts men from 21 to 45. Great Britain has been at war for a year and up until this time she has only called a few of the men who are now 31 or 32 years of age. We are at peace; why should we conscript men 35, 40, and 45 years of age? Why should we obstruct the lives of twelve, fifteen, twenty-five million American boys and men to bail Great Britain and other European nations out every time we raise a new crop of boys? Anyhow, there is no law to keep these citizens of the United States who are so anxious to conscript these 25,000,000 men and boys to volunteer themselves for service in the Army, Navy, and Air Corps. Most of those who are urging conscription have never worn the uniform of this country, and they never will.

I was greatly heartened today to hear the able and splendid speeches of our colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who served at the front in Europe in the last World War, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], who lost both legs in that war, and other veterans of that war in the House who, too, have expressed strong opposition to this bill and will vote against it. They, of course, are opposed to our intervention in the European-Asiatic-African war. They are strong for the defense of our own country but opposed to meddling in the wars of other nations.

#### DO NOT HAVE FAITH IN THE PRESIDENT

There is a general feeling throughout the Nation that President Roosevelt will eventually involve us in the European-Asiatic-African war.

Winston Churchill, the British Prime Minister, recently stated that a fusion between Great Britain and the United

States is inexorable. In other words, these two nations are bound to unite—in war, of course. He further said that in 1941 Great Britain will take command of the air, and he expressed the hope by that time the United States will be in the war with them and furnish money, men, and munitions unsparingly as we did in 1917 and 1918. A British lord has been in this country for some time, and he told Senator WHEELER that he got this country into war with Great Britain and France in 1917 and 1918 and he believed he could get this country to join England in this war. I have no doubt but what there was a definite understanding developed when the King and Queen of England visited the United States last year with our own officials to aid Great Britain in the event of war. Some time ago it was discovered that the President had authorized the Acting Secretary of the Navy to transfer to Great Britain 20 or more of our latest-model submarines. They were the latest—they had not been quite completed. The Attorney General advised the President this was a violation of law, and the trade was declared off; but in the face of that opinion we found out recently that many shiploads of arms, bombs, and other munitions of war had been secretly sent by this Government to Great Britain.

It was not discovered until recently. This important transaction was kept from the American people, and the President announced today in a message that he had traded at least 50 of our destroyers, a part of our Navy, to Great Britain for certain military and naval air bases. I shall not discuss the advisability of making this trade, but all of us must condemn the way and manner in which it was made. It violated one of the plainest laws on our statute books—it violated a solemn treaty of the United States—it violated international law. The President had no right whatever to do this thing without action on the part of Congress. Congress was not even consulted. There are some Americans who will applaud this action, but if we stop to think, we must know, if the President can illegally do this with these destroyers and other arms of the United States without an act of Congress, then he could turn over to Great Britain, or any other country, a hundred or 200 destroyers or cruisers, battleships, or aircraft. In other words, he could dispose of our entire Navy and other equipment for our national defense. If he can openly and notoriously violate the law as to 50 cruisers, he could do it as to the entire equipment of our entire Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. Do the American people desire the President, who is sworn to uphold the law, to openly defy the law? Congress has been a rubber stamp so long for him that he now ignores the Congress, the representatives of the American people, altogether.

Mr. Roosevelt has defied another American tradition. He is so ambitious for power that he has flouted the advice of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and all the other great Presidents, and the resolutions adopted by his own party and in Congress and in the Senate denouncing the third term. He has bet his all on the throw for a third term. He is trying to create the impression that he is the indispensable man to meet another one of his indispensable emergencies. A majority of the Supreme Court now are new dealers. He has taken the purse strings from the Congress. He has in his hands billions of dollars. He is now grasping for the sword—the manpower of this country. I am unwilling to place this enormous manpower into the hands of any President in peacetime, and I certainly do not favor placing the 25,000,000 men provided in this bill and the other millions as the years come and go and they reach the age of 21 under the thumb of such a politically ambitious Chief Executive as Mr. Roosevelt.

The great issue is, Shall this great country follow the pathway of peace and prosperity or be involved in the European-Asiatic-African war, and thereby completely bankrupt this country, completely upset its economic, social, and political life, and more than likely end with the loss of our own liberties and freedom?

Devoutly believing that this is another step of our ambitious President to involve us in that war is another good reason for me to vote against the bill.

LXXXVI—718

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is getting late, and I apologize for inflicting myself on the House at this time, but I understood from the statement of the Chairman of the Committee earlier today that everybody was to have some opportunity to say something about this bill, if he wanted to; and so with that as an excuse I will proceed during my 10 minutes.

In my estimation this is the least called for piece of legislation that we have had presented to us in my experience in the Seventy-sixth Congress. And that is not all, it is going to be the most expensive piece of legislation, not only from the standpoint of dollars and cents, but if I am not mistaken, from the standpoint of the destruction of all the values that you and I and the people of the United States of America value most highly. It is the most asinine and the most degrading piece of legislation which it has been my privilege to see handed to a "rubber stamp" Congress.

Who is it that wants this bill? Who is it? You Members of Congress know who it is. It is the powers that be behind the throne that try to control the Government of this country and usurp the prerogatives of the people. Why, if a popular referendum were held on this bill 75 percent of the people would vote against it, and in my own district the percentage would run much higher.

Who is it wants this bill? A few professional Army men who hope thereby to enlarge their power, increase their rank and salary, and to perpetuate themselves a little more firmly in their profession.

Who is it wants this bill? A few people with hatred in their hearts, who feel that by promoting this idea we are going to scare somebody. France is a glaring example of the theory which is expressed in this conscription bill that we are going to scare somebody by training a few million men. France had upward of 6,000,000 men fully trained and armed. Did she scare anybody?

No; France did not scare anybody, as you well know from the situation which exists with reference to the Republic of France today. As an opposite to that fact, we have the case of England that is holding out without having had a conscript army and with only a small standing army previous to the outbreak of the present European conflict. It is holding out in the face of the tremendous pressure of armies from Germany, from Italy, and Central Europe, who have been knocking at her door for the past several weeks.

Mr. PATRICK. Is the gentleman against all preparedness?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am not against preparedness of the right sort. I believe in wise preparedness and have voted for all bills for the expansion of our Army, Navy, and air force. That is the point I am going to make right now; what sort of preparedness do we want and will we get it by passing this bill?

The statement was made this afternoon by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], that the reason we need this bill is because 60 percent of the deaths during the World War were caused by lack of preparedness. Now, that has about as much sense to it as an argument for this bill as some of these military men in our Army express, and some of our high Government officials who are trying to run this thing, and are cramming it down our throats, and who do not know what it is all about. If you ask them, they do not know what they are preparing for. I have been asking them that question for years, and they all say, why, we are preparing to fight the same as we did in 1917-18. They forget that styles, even in war, change.

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that there is no 1917-18 trench warfare being carried on in this particular war, which would necessitate the training and use of large bodies of men. Have you heard of any trenches being used, and if they were being used, how much good were they? How far did they prevent the advance of the well-mechanized, fast-moving enemy? Oh, no, this is a different war. This is the war of 1939 to 1946.

This is a different war. This is a war where speed, mechanization, motors, airplanes, and ships are important. How many men are you going to train to fly airplanes, and to speed antiaircraft motortrucks up and down our highways which we should be building a lot more of, and how many men are we going to train to run our battleships, and our destroyers, and tanks, and airplanes, if we can keep any of them? How many men are you going to be able to train for those purposes, I say, by shouldering rifles, if we had some to shoulder, and by running them up and down an infantry drill field, as is proposed by this bill?

It also seems reasonable to ask the committee what will these men be prepared to do after this year's training, as proposed under the pending bill? In the light of modern warfare, what will these men be prepared to do? Has anybody been able to answer that question yet? Then there is another question. What are these men going to be needed for that we are going to march up and down these infantry fields after we debate and pass this bill?

Just what are they going to be needed for? Are they going to be needed to fight in the trenches of England? Are they going to be needed to fight down in South America or in Mexico? Are they going to be needed to fight in China or Japan or just where do you propose to use these men after you train them? I think that is an important question to be considered. If you are going to take from the homes of America millions of men and train them, these questions should be answered—train them for what and for where? The people of the United States are entitled to know also that these conscripts will be trained for the duties they will be called on to perform. But if we can get no answers to these pertinent questions from the proponents of this bill, then are we to be blamed if we doubt their sincerity or question their judgment? And if we conclude that the real purpose and reason for peacetime conscription lies hidden in some deep, dark recess somewhere, perhaps with the hoarded gold in the hills of Kentucky or perhaps up in Wall Street, or even in London, can we be blamed?

Train them for what? Train them to be used where? If you are going to train them to fight Japan, I submit that you are not going to fight Japan on our east or west coast or even in Mexico or Alaska. You are going to fight Japan over in the Orient, in China where trained officers and matériel alone will be important; perhaps in the Philippines—more likely a naval war in the Pacific Ocean. Are you going to train these men that you are conscripting here for those particular purposes? No. They will be no more fitted after their year's training to carry on that kind of warfare than they are today. And what is worse, their time will have been wasted, and our time for preparedness and billions of dollars of our money and national resources will also have been squandered and foolishly destroyed.

Are you going to use them in South America, as was suggested here this afternoon? If that is the purpose, then I suggest what you need is more trained officers and fast moving mechanical equipment, which can go down into South America, if that is what the country wants to do, and lead the millions of loyal but penniless South Americans against the onslaught of what we are told is about to happen to them if we do not watch out.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. In just a minute.

We have heard it said that we need only to conscript men that that alone is democratic, that we do not need to conscript industry or factories, or wealth, for that is undemocratic. It is also said that we can only be democratic if we conscript men from 21 to 31, according to the Senate bill, or from 21 to 45, according to this bill which has been presented to the House. I conclude, however, from my observations of what democracy really is, that it would be much more democratic, if we are going to conscript anybody or anything, to conscript everybody, including the Members of the Congress who are going to vote for this bill. [Applause.] Why is it any less democratic to conscript real estate, buildings, machinery, and equipment of any kind, including all

the wealth in this Nation, than to conscript the bodies, the blood, the lives, and the health of our young men, the flower of our American manhood?

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. If conscription were carried to that point, of course, that would amount to a dictatorship for this country and this bill is the first step toward dictatorship.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is correct, dictatorship will be the net result of the passage of this bill. If that is what the Members of Congress want, then you are going to lose your jobs as Congressmen because you do not deserve to represent free Americans any longer. There will be little for you to do except as figureheads shortly after the passage of this bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the danger is so great that we have to pass this bill conscripting American citizens between the ages of 21 and 45 for compulsory peacetime military service, why should we exclude from the draft, as the pending bill does, millions of politicians, including legislative windjammers and millions of aliens?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is right. I say conscript them all. Let us conscript everything and everybody if we are going to conscript at all. The old saying is what is good for the goose is also good for the gander. I, for one, will not vote to make the young men and women of America again the goats in this foolishness.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am wondering if the gentleman from Minnesota meant that this was a first step to a dictatorship or the last step?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I believe you have something there.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I would like to know if the gentleman has seen the map of where we are going to fight? He asked the question. May I say that the American Army is going to fight in Sudan, Arabia, and Egypt.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am not so sure but that the gentleman's guess is pretty close to being right after getting the President's message and after reading some of the sections in the bill which has been presented to us today. It is a terrible piece of "Hitleresque" legislation and should be voted down so we can concentrate on some real constructive preparedness in the way of mechanization, training of mechanics, of aviators, and of naval officers and men for a greatly expanded Navy and air force. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PATMAN] having resumed the chair, Mr. SHEPPARD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10132) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD following the President's message of today and include therein a statement from H. R. Stark, admiral, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short statement by the Mothers of America, giving their views on the bill now before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include therein a brief newspaper article appearing in the Washington News of September 3, with reference to the destroyer sale, indicating that the people of Australia were advised about the sale and transfer of 50 of our Navy's destroyers to the British before the Congress of the United States was notified.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of September 3, 1940]

DESTROYER SALE AGREED, C. B. S. HEARS

(By United Press)

NEW YORK, September 3.—The Australian wireless today broadcast an indirect report that agreement has been reached for transfer of 50 overage United States destroyers to Britain.

"The C. B. S. short-wave listening station picked up an Australian wireless report that Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney, chairman of Pan-American Airways, arriving at Auckland, New Zealand, said he understood the agreement to transfer 50 American destroyers to Britain had been signed," said the C. B. S. statement.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein excerpts from two or three short letters and a part of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also a letter from a constituent, Mr. Paul Hanchett.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein quotations from various publications and magazines; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein quotations from the press and from magazines.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a few remarks by the Honorable Ernest P. Jacobson, of Minnesota, on the subject of the homestead-lien law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial from the Daily Register-Mail, of Galesburg, Ill., dated August 28, 1940, entitled "It Is War; Not Short of War."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today, and to include therein the text of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] has requested that I ask unanimous consent that his special order for today be transferred to Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, Saturday afternoon occurred a disaster on a transport liner, operated by Pennsylvania-Central Airlines, on a regular schedule on its route from Washington via Pittsburgh and Cleveland into Detroit. This accident, which took place close to my own congressional district, claimed the lives of 25 persons. In the group was a former Member of this House, who was later elected to the Senate of the United States. I refer to that distinguished legislator, the gentleman from Minnesota, ERNEST LUNDEEN. I knew him in this body, as did many of you, as a diligent and sincere public official, a man who had studied for many, many years, in and out of public life, the problems and possibilities of aviation.

I shall not attempt this evening to place the blame on any agency of the Government of the United States for this tragedy. I do say that personally I voted against the reorganization plan of the President when the independent Safety Board was abolished and we had a revamping of the Civil Aeronautics Authority of this country.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Every one of us here is listening with interest to the remarks of the able student of aviation from West Virginia. Without attempting at this time to place the blame for what has happened, is it not a remarkable coincidence that the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia and many of us here in this House predicted that if the transfer were made exactly this sort of tragedy would happen?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In reply to the observation of the gentleman from Ohio, who, I want to say, was a director of aeronautics for his own State prior to his membership in this body, it is true that many of us attempted to point out that we believed it would be a mistake to reorganize the constituted Civil Aeronautics Authority, which this Congress had brought into being.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not a pity that we now have to investigate the cause of this accident with no separate air-safety board, but those who investigate it are those who had something to do with the decisions which created the accident?

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just a second before he goes further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. Does not the gentleman think, before we pursue that idea to any conclusion at all, we had better wait until we see whether there is some evidence of neglect?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, my remarks are not intended as a request for congressional investigation and I have not said so. The observations made by our colleague from Ohio would tend in that direction. This tragedy has occurred, a tragedy which is a blow to the commercial aviation industry of this country.

I have flown over that territory many, many times in transport planes and in small chartered planes, and I firmly believe that the accident happened after something had incapacitated the pilots. The ship certainly was out of control.

I wish to go on from that point and not dwell upon the accident aspects because the public has an interest in a matter of this kind, a very real and sustained interest. The men and women look to the future. So do we, but let me go back.

I call to your attention the remarks which I made on January 15, 1936, when I spoke on this floor following what up until that time was the greatest tragedy on the air-transport system of this country, namely, the accident which took place in Arkansas on American Airlines. I said on the day after that accident occurred, 4½ years ago:

Commercial aviation in America and in the world today has been dealt a stunning blow, but only temporarily so, because in the future those who are charged with carrying on this great industry will continue to so improve the planes in which men and women fly, so improve the airports where the planes land and take off, and so improve all conditions necessary to successful continued progress in aviation that they will lessen greatly the number of casualties just as those who pioneered in railroad transportation were called upon to do.

In that connection I want to say that since that accident happened, the safety record of the Commercial transport air lines of this country has been truly remarkable. In the past 17½ months no fatality took place, and more than 3,100,000 persons were carried. The company which had this recent accident finds for the first time in its 14 years of transportation of passengers on its routes a fatality, a truly wonderful record for Pennsylvania Central Airlines.

Last evening I traveled on a plane of this company from Pittsburgh to Washington. I had spoken late in the afternoon in my own congressional district near Morgantown and drove from that city to the Allegheny County Airport and boarded a plane of the Pennsylvania Central Airlines. I reasoned there might be some unoccupied seats, but all of them on that plane were taken by the 21 passengers making a normal flight to and from their pleasure or business. I thought to myself then that the American public, to use a slang expression, is "sold" on the safety of air-transport travel.

I understand that heavy travel has existed today. It will exist tomorrow and in the tomorrows, in that this company, as well as other companies, will continue to transport more men and women in safety, in comfort, and with speed.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my colleague from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like to make this contribution, if my friend would allow.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am delighted to yield to my friend.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like to say that while I commend the people who are in control of the navigation of the air mechanically, yet I reserve any commendation insofar as the Government is concerned for its installation of the necessary precautionary measures. Some people who listen to me know whereof I speak when I say that there are certain areas in which there are no Weather Bureau facilities. I could call names. I could point to men sitting here who know from experience of 35 minutes in a cyclone, who were told when they started from a certain field that they could get to Washington uninterrupted by a storm, and they ran into a cyclone in an area in which there were no Weather Bureau facilities. I think it is a crime—no more and no less.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The observation of the gentleman is certainly a contribution to a discussion of this kind. Many of us have fought for proper navigation aids. In my own State of West Virginia there were no navigation aids up until a year and a half ago. I think that may have been true in the gentleman's State.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will you let me say this: This gentleman sitting near me and myself were blown 57 miles into your State off of our course by a cyclone.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Now, I wish I might again read for a few minutes. On January 15, 1936, I said in concluding my speech:

I comment on this tragedy—

That was 4½ years ago—

that it is a lesson for the Members of Congress to encourage us in every way and not discourage us, working for those improvements

and advancements that will take away from commercial aviation in this country certain of the hazards that still exist.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH (continuing reading):

The pilots of progress in this outstanding transport industry will continue to carry forward, and especially in America do I feel that that shall lead us to continued improvement and success. Not only the pilots who fly the planes, but all those connected with this great enterprise are truly pilots of progress on the onward march of American civilization.

Those words have come true again and again. Only yesterday we found the Pan-American Airways cutting off 1 day in its schedule from South America to the United States. I read from an article in today's Times-Herald, by Glenn Dillard Gunn:

#### SPEEDIER AIR LINK TO UNITED STATES WELCOMED IN BUENOS AIRES PROGRESS OPPOSED

While the clippers fly fast, and faster still to facilitate the communications of the businessman, at home, in the Senate of the United States the isolationists still seek to halt the tide of progress. No one who does business abroad—and there are 26,000 of our people who earn their livelihood, directly or indirectly, in foreign trade—can understand an isolationist.

Three days from New York to Buenos Aires, a day to Europe, the distance to Japan and Australia measured now in days and hours where it once was counted in months—those who dwell in the far parts of the earth have become our neighbors.

#### THREE DAYS TO NEW YORK

Pan-American officials seem certain that 3 days to Miami by the new overland route is but a step away; that presently the schedule will read 3 days to New York; that the stratosphere clippers, comfortable, safe, and unbelievably fast, have only begun their triumphs over time and space; that the world is too small now to talk of political or commercial isolation, whatever some of our Senators may say.

We as Members of the Congress of the United States and all those who are in a position of authority in this Government, as well as individuals who are charged with the actual operation of the transport system of commercial aviation in this country, and as it is linked to the other countries, know that Saturday's accident, sad as it is to all of us—is simply that which sometimes happens. We must continue our every effort to go forward with the improvement of the aviation industry in this country of yours and mine.

Mr. EDMISTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my able colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. EDMISTON. Does not my colleague think that accidents such as the sad accident which occurred last Saturday will be impossible when we are using the stratosphere?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; you will be above the bad weather. We all know that type of flying is coming.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman has had vast experience in flying. I use the Pennsylvania Central Airlines frequently myself. Last night I sent my 8-year-old daughter back to Pittsburgh on one of their planes. I have often thought as I sat in a plane, though, how absolutely the passenger is in the hands of the pilot. In every Army or Navy plane, every person who goes up has a parachute. I ask those of you who are experienced in these matters why the passenger in commercial planes is not given some individual chance? He sits in that plane but if one man, the pilot, makes a mistake or does the wrong thing, all in the plane may be lost. Why cannot the individual passenger have a parachute? There must be a very good reason for it, but I would like to know it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. For years it has been the belief of some of those of an inventive turn of mind that eventually our transport system planes will be equipped with some type of device so that when planes run into trouble in the

sky the passengers might land in safety. What will happen in the future I cannot tell, but the proposal at least has been discussed.

I thank the House for the attention it has given me on this subject. The public is increasingly air-minded. It has confidence in air travel. I firmly believe that confidence is not misplaced. [Applause.]

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MAGNUSON, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. SATTERFIELD (at the request of Mr. DARDEN of Virginia), for 3 days, on account of illness.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE ERNEST LUNDEEN

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 589

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, a Senator of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

*Resolved*, That a committee of four Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Chair appoints the following Members of the part of the House to attend the funeral: Messrs. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, MAAS, RYAN, and BUCKLER of Minnesota.

The Clerk will report the balance of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 4, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, September 4, 1940, for the consideration of Senate bill 3248, regarding the pay of immigration inspectors for overtime.

#### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, September 5, 1940, at 10 a. m., on the following bill: H. R. 10380, a bill to expedite national defense by suspending, during the national emergency, provisions of law that prohibit more than 8 hours' labor in any 1 day of persons engaged upon work covered by contracts of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1929. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1941, amount to \$11,000, for salaries of the Criminal Division, Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 942), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 9656. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of property for the Vicksburg National Military Park, in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; without amend-

ment (Rept. No. 2911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HORTON: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 10402. A bill to amend the act relating to rentals in certain oil and gas leases; without amendment (Rept. No. 2912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 55. Concurrent resolution recommending that any parties or organizations advocating overthrow of the United States Government be prohibited from entering candidates in any State or national elections; with amendment (Rept. No. 2913). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 10438. A bill to extend the age limits for applicants for appointment as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; with amendment (Rept. No. 2914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. POAGE: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 10190. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Dulin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HART: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 7784. A bill for the relief of Howard R. M. Browne; without amendment (Rept. No. 2907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HART: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 6489. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Velie Motors Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HART: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 4257. A bill for the relief of the estate of Bartholomew Lawler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 10444. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 10445. A bill to authorize maintenance and use of a banking house upon the United States Military Reservation at Hickam Field, Oahu, Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 10446. A bill disqualifying any member of the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, or certain other organizations for licensing as operator of any radio station on any ship of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. J. Res. 601. Joint resolution for the promotion of safety in air travel by the construction of uniform identifying land markers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEROUEN:

H. R. 10447. A bill confirming the claim of Patrick Morgan and Daniel Clark to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, County of Attakapas, now Parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. 97 in report of Commissioners dated May 1, 1815; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10448. A bill for the relief of Edward F. Shea; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 10449. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Hegarty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 10450. A bill admitting to citizenship and fully naturalizing Lelia M. Dodd; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 10451. A bill to provide for placing Leland Cavanah Poole on the retired list of the United States Navy as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 10452. A bill granting a pension to Inez Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 10453. A bill for the relief of James M. Hays; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10454. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 10455. A bill for the relief of certain persons whose crops were destroyed or damaged by high waters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9256. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Petition of Ralls County (Mo.) Post, No. 234, of the American Legion, favoring enactment of a general conscription act and other national defense measures; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9257. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Charles M. Stewart, secretary, representing Rotary Club of Murray, Ky., asserting their support of the program to protect and defend our country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9258. By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: Petition of Judge Frank Y. Patterson and many other prominent citizens of Bowling Green, Ky., urging the President and the Congress to sell to England 50 of our surplus destroyers for immediate delivery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9259. Also, resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Owensboro, Ky., urging the immediate passage of the Burke-Wadsworth bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9260. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John Schultz, of East St. Louis, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the case, No. 219147, *John Schultz v. Mather Stock Car Co.*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9261. Also, petition of the Allen Plan Society, Wilmington, Del., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9262. Also, petition of Work Projects Administration Union, Local No. 1, United Federal Workers of America, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the selective compulsory military service bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9263. Also, petition of New Jersey State Association Chiefs of Police, Asbury Park, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

#### SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, August 5, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. W. L. Darby, D. D., executive secretary, Washington Federation of Churches, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we come before Thee today in the shadow of a great sorrow. Stark tragedy suddenly has come upon us and we have suffered the loss of a devoted Member of this Senate in a dreadful catastrophe of the air. We thank Thee for those qualities of mind and heart which endeared him to his friends and made him so useful a servant of the country he loved. We are grateful for the virtues which he possessed and for the high ideals of public service which he displayed in so many ways.

Now that he has gone from us, stricken down in the midst of a career of such great usefulness, we feel a sense of irreparable loss. Thy Divine comfort we ask for the family circle from which he has gone to return no more. May they have the assurance of the compassion of a loving God in this hour of grief and loneliness. In the face of the death which has brought his body to the grave may they be sustained by the steadfast hope of the life immortal and the joys that are in store in that heavenly land for all believers—a place where sorrow and tears are no longer known.

May his spirit of deep consecration to his country's welfare and his concern for all humanity brood over his colleagues in this body as they meet here today and note that his seat is empty because his earthly life is ended.

May we indeed cherish his memory and endeavor to emulate his example. Grant to the Members of this august body as they mourn his loss a firm resolution that they will give their best to the service of God and country as long as their lives may be spared.

Through these troubled days may we all have a sense of Thy presence in the world and seek to know and do Thy holy will. So, whether the days which remain for each of us be few or many, let us live in the light of eternity and make faithful use of our gifts and talents until the end comes for us, as it has come for him, and we, too, fall asleep to waken in the home above, beyond the sunset glow—that place of "many mansions" prepared for those who love our Lord.

In Christ's name we ask it. Amen.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER

Under the designation of the President pro tempore of August 31, 1940, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, took the Chair.

#### DEATH OF SENATOR LUNDEEN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, we are all saddened today by the tragic death in an airplane accident on Saturday last of our colleague, Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota. At a time more suitable for eulogies of his public service and character and in testimony of the friendships which he created here in the Senate we will devote the opportunity to pay appropriate tribute to our departed colleague. At the present time, out of respect to his memory, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 306) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

*Resolved*, That a committee of four Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. As a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, September 5, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.